THE IRRECUSABLE ANSWER

English translation of Intiṣār al-Islām

Written by:
Ḥujjat al-Islām Ḥaḍrat Mawlānā
Muḥammad Qāsim Nānautavī
Founder of Darul Uloom Deoband

The Irrecusable Answers

(English translation of Intiṣār al-Islām)

This book consists of coherent responses to objections raised by Pandit Dayanand Saraswati against Islamic creeds.

Ḥujjat al-Islām Ḥaḍrat Mawlānā
Muḥammad Qāsim Nānautavī
Founder of Darul Uloom Deoband

Commentary and annotation
Mawlānā Ishtiyāq Aḥmad

Translated by
Anwar Aziz Usmani

Table of Content

Translator’s Note

To interpret, simplify, and promote the knowledge and wisdom of Ḥujjat al-Islām Ḥaḍrat Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānautavī has been among the primary objectives of Ḥujjat al-Islām Academy. It is an unfortunate truth that despite being widely acknowledged as the most remarkable work on Islamic Philosophy and new ‘Ilm al-Kalām on the Indian soil, the writings of Ḥaḍrat Nānautavī have not been given their due right. Very minimal efforts have been put into translating his work from Urdu to other global languages. Against this backdrop, Ḥujjat al-Islām Academy has undertaken to perform this service with an aim to introduce this luminary personality and his intellectual legacy on the global scale.

It is a matter of immense honor for me that I was shouldered to translate one of his notable writings into English, namely Intiṣār al-Islām. This is, perhaps, the first ever English translation of any of the writings of Ḥaḍrat Nānautavī. Looking at my lack of competency and profoundness of the subject, I was in the beginning highly doubtful that I would be able to do the job. Indeed, it is only with the blessing and assistance of the Almighty that I was able to complete the seemingly uphill task. Whether I am successful in my endeavor or not, is up to the readers to decide. The readers are humbly requested to be frank in expressing their critical views, so that if there are any flaws of diction or linguistic errors, they can be rectified in the subsequent editions.

The original text in front of us was an old edition of Intiṣār al-Islām with commentary and annotation published by Maktaba Darul Uloom Deoband. The notable work of adding commentary and explanatory notes performed by Mawlānā Ishtiyāq Aḥmad under the supervision of 'Majlis Ma'ārif al-Quran' made it easy to understand the intent of the author. In the Urdu edition, the commentary was inserted in between the original text but it was bordered with lines to make it distinguishable. However, we decided to move it to footnotes in order to preserve the flow of the main text, except some brief notes that have been put in brackets wherever deemed necessary. In addition, at some points, I have also added few notes from my side to make the subject even more comprehensible.

In the end, I ask Allah Almighty to accept this humble service and make it beneficial for the seekers of knowledge. Ameen!

Anwar Aziz Usmani
Researcher, Ḥujjat al-Islām Academy
Darul Uloom Waqf Deoband

Publisher’s Note

I offer my humblest gratitude to the Most Benevolent and the Most Merciful God whose endless blessings chose me, as the person in charge of wide-ranging assignments undertaken by Ḥujjat al-Islām Academy, the research department of Darul Uloom Waqf Deoband, to serve and disseminate the outstanding knowledge and academic legacy of our predecessors in various ways. This includes simplifying the profound knowledge and wisdom of the founder of Darul Uloom Deoband, Ḥujjat al-Islām Ḥaḍrat Imām Muḥammad Qāsim Nānautavī, keeping in view the capacity of contemporary minds. Indeed, performing this task in such a way that the comprehensive objective and intent of the author remain intact, and at the same time doors are opened for today’s readers to benefit from that knowledge, is a challenging task. However, the positive results of this service are evident and a considerable number of thinkers and learned men are making good use of it.

At present, another important service which deserves our attention and which is the need of the hour is to introduce the encyclopedic knowledge and line of thought of the founder of Darul Uloom Deoband to the world community. Undeniably, apart from being the medium of communication internationally, English language is the commonly understood language of modern educated circle within the country. Besides, to approach reputed academic, educational, and social circles of the Islamic world, Arabic language is inevitable. Therefore, these two languages were chosen, for

the time being, to begin the noble work of translating this treasure of knowledge, and it was included in the primary objectives of the Academy. All praise be to God! Within the span of four years, the Academy has successfully produced more than twenty-five publications in Urdu, Arabic, and English languages including translation of several magnificent books, and has earned acclamation of many celebrated scholars and academic circles domestically as well as globally. Indeed, the attestation of such men of letters is a source of motivation for me as well as all my colleagues. Alḥamdulillāh.

The men of knowledge can understand that the later task is even more difficult than the former task of simplification, as paraphrasing the author's intent as it is, without any addition and subtraction, in another language is not less than a herculean task. Apparently, it requires much more than plain translating skills. In fact, in order to fully understand the author's intent, the translator is required to have expertise in the relevant subjects, good knowledge of old as well as new terminologies and vocabulary of that particular discipline, and necessary academic competency to assimilate all the general and particular concepts related to the topic. The men of learning are well aware of the fact that literal translation of any paragraph, excerpt, or book into another language is not such a difficult job. But to transfer the spirit of a write-up to another language, maintaining the precision and delicacy of the original content is an extremely tiresome job. However, with the blessings of the Almighty and prayers of the elders, the combined efforts of my sincere and passionate teammates accompanied by their enthusiasm for knowledge and practice have facilitated this laborious task. It would indeed be an ungrateful gesture not to pay tribute to the efforts and

academic service of the translator of this treatise, brother Maulana Anwar Aziz Usmani whose intellectual as well as academic abilities played an important role in accomplishment of this toil.

The book before us, Intiṣār al-Islām, is not a proper write-up of Ḥaḍrat Nānautavī, rather it is a compilation of his speeches comprised of elemental responses to objections and attacks by Pandit Dayanand Saraswati against Islamic creeds. Looking at the usefulness and far-reaching effects of these intuited responses, his able disciple, Ḥaḍrat Mawlānā Fakhrul Ḥasan Gangohi, compiled them together for common utility and presented to Ḥaḍrat Nānautavī after naming it Intiṣār al-Islām. Ḥaḍrat Nānautavī expressed his liking, made corrections at few places, and approved its publication. Thereafter, it received status of a proper book.

One more thing which adds value to this book is that since inception of Islam, the approach and methods of its opponents to attack Islam have not changed much. Whether it is existence of God and his absolute power, which is the basis of the Islamic creed of monotheism, or it is the messengership of The Final Messenger (peace be upon him), which is the foundation of Islamic Shariah, creating doubts and confusions about these matters solely on rational grounds with an aim to misguide the Muslim masses has been the primary goal of the opponents of Islam. If you inspect closely, you will see that, despite difference of expression, the principal constituents of such objections have remained the same from Abu Jahal, Shaybah, and Utbah to modern orientalists and the likes of Pundit Dayanand Saraswati. You will not find any difference in the underlying elements of these objections, even though during the last fourteenth centuries every

single objection of such kind has been responded with detailed and well-argued answers from all the possible aspects which has in turn produced a great treasure of knowledge. For example, in the case of Pandit Dayanand, at some places he tried to confuse prostrating towards the holy Kaaba with worship of stones and idols and at others he attempted to create doubt about the omnipotence of Allah asserting His inability to kill Himself. He can be seen trying his best to attack basic creeds of Muslim masses using his weak and fabricated arguments.

On global level too, you will observe that the same course of action with the same objective is being followed by the opponents of Islam in various forms and colors; whether they are orientalists or so-called modern liberals, whether they are polytheists or atheists, all such groups are following the same pattern. It is for this reason and to discharge the common obligation that the book in hand, Intiṣār al-Islām, which comprises universal responses of Ḥaḍrat Nānautavī to many such objections, was chosen to be translated in English. We hope that this book will prove to be helpful for the warriors of this battlefield in terms of solid rational arguments and will be a source of motivation for their actions.

At last, I request the readers to ask the Almighty to accept this humble effort, give the best reward to everyone involved in its production, and make us follow the footsteps of our elders. Ameen!

Muhammad Shakaib Qasmi
Director, Ḥujjat al-Islām Academy
Darul Uloom Waqf Deoband

Foreword

There has been no period of time in the history, from the creation of human being till today, in which truth and falsehood were not engaged in a hostile confrontation. This eternal hostility and confrontation are among the *takwīnī* affairs of the universe and are inevitable and unchangeable part of the divine wisdom. In fact, the conflict between truth and falsehood began with the beginning of creation itself when the accursed Iblīs disobeyed the divine commandment to prostrate before Adam (PBUH) and went on to rebel against Allah the Exalted. As the Holy Quran mentions:

قَالَ مَا مَنَعَكَ أَلَّا تَسْجُدَ إِذْ أَمَرْتُكَ ۖ قَالَ أَنَا خَيْرٌ مِّنْهُ خَلَقْتَنِي مِن نَّارٍ وَخَلَقْتَهُ مِن طِينٍ

> *[Allah] said, "What prevented you from prostrating when I commanded you?" [Satan] said, "I am better than him. You created me from fire and created him from clay". [Al-A'raf, 7:12]*

This arrogant attitude of Iblīs was the reason of his expulsion and exile from the heavens for good. The Holy Quran has asserted this at many places in different ways in accordance to the context. Since this disobedience and rebellion of Satan was a result of his arrogance and envy, he requested Allah to let him live till the Day of Judgement

so that he could misguide the children of Adam and would make it his life mission. He said: I will use the primary weakness of his children – their tendency to follow carnal desire – as a weapon and will drag them to the path of hellfire by triggering in them the inherent impulse of rebellion and urge of sins. And I can tell, on the basis of knowledge given by You, that I will attain success in my mission through different ways and, ultimately, I will dominate men, except for a small number of Your close and sincere devotees who will be fully conscious of Your greatness and majesty, who will completely submit to Your command and will, and who will be dived in the color of Allah. Those will be the men who will easily reach salvation in the light of Your true guidance and I will have no hold upon them.

At the end, this request of the cursed one was granted approval by the divine will. It shows that the struggle between truth and falsehood had been there since inception, and a fine line between the two contrasts was drawn by the divine wisdom at the onset of this temporary world, and it is going to continue at every stage and in every period of human life until the Dooms Day. It is because this law of contrasts is the basis to examine the whole system of human life and its corresponding components of the universe; from macrocosm to microcosm, from particulars to universals, from material to physical, from ideas to ideologies, and from religions to rightly-guided and misguided sects. Belief and disbelief, guidance and misguidance, truth and falsehood, religions and sects, contrasting requirements of body and soul, cultures and civilizations, doctrines and ideologies, life and death, reward and punishment, provision and dress, in

short, there is no stage or facet of human life which is not governed by the law of contrasts and where the borderline between truth and falsehood is not clearly defined.

However, all these falls under the realm of perceptibles which, by the bestowal of Allah, have the possibility to be perceived by human mind and intellect. But as a poet says: There exist other worlds beyond stars, the profound wisdom of the Almighty that is concealed in this distinction of truth and falsehood is far beyond the capacity of human intellect, rather it is even outside the domain of possibility of human imagination and comprehension just like the Eternal Being Himself and His eternal attributes, with the exception of the knowledge given by Him through his sacred book.

تَبَارَكَ الَّذِي بِيَدِهِ الْمُلْكُ وَهُوَ عَلَى كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيرٌ الَّذِي خَلَقَ
الْمَوْتَ وَالْحَيَاةَ لِيَبْلُوَكُمْ أَيُّكُمْ أَحْسَنُ عَمَلًا

Blessed is He in whose hand is dominion, and He is over all things competent. [He] who created death and life to test you [as to] which of you is best in deed. [Al-Mulk, 1-2]

This verse hides in itself countless gems of the divine wisdom behind creating truth and falsehood, as life and death are two sides of the same universal concept. It is impossible to understand life and its components without understanding its opposite; death. And the same applies to its reverse. There is a saying in Arabic which is popular as a proverb among the people of knowledge: "الأشياء تعرف بأضدادها", things are recognized through their opposite. The

reality, essence, wisdom, and advantage of creations of the world – no matter if they are big or small, valuable or worthless – cannot be apprehended by human intellect until and unless their opposite is cognized. The darkness of night and its effects on the system of universe owe their recognition to daylight. The identification of black depends on the presence of white. The advantage of knowledge and learning cannot be understood without knowing the disadvantage of ignorance.

In short, all the constituents of the universe – be it material and physical or mental and spiritual, be it related to the Trimatters or The Four Elements, or the intrinsic nature of anything – can come into perception only under the law of contrasts enacted by Allah the Exalted. In other words, the knowledge of benefits and drawbacks, advantage and disadvantage of anything is only possible with the knowledge of its opposite thing, because the two realities are linked in such a way that human intellect is unable to grasp the qualities of one thing without understanding the reality of its contrast. Therefore, it is inevitable to know both positive and negative sides of elements in order to reach their essence and reality. Deep study of contrasting natures of water, fire, air, and soil and detailed analysis of contradictory temperament and conflicting properties of the Trimatters coupled with experiments form the basis of gradual material development. For example, the properties of water include coldness and flowage which form its intrinsic temperament, while in its opposite element – fire – heat, burning, and upward movement are the dominant properties. The human

being intensively studied and analyzed the nature of both elements using the God-gifted ability of his mind and concluded that if these two contrasting energies are collided with each other, the collision may create a new energy in which the qualities of both energies may open new doors of advancement for the human world. As a result, this experiment led humans to the discovery of the power of steam which took humanity to the new heights of material development. This is an evident law of nature which has been ordained by Allah.

As much as the realm of physics, this law is equally effective in the metaphysical realm. If the darkness of disbelief and atheism was not there, how would the light of faith and belief be distinguished? If the devil's new world order was not spreading chaos all around the globe, how would the significance and meaningfulness of the measures taken to protect religion and faith would be revealed? And what else would be the stimulus to this course of action? And the same is the situation of progress in the realm of materials.

Subsequently, when we study the history of strife between truth and falsehood in the light of this law of contrast, we find that there was no period in the history of humanity which was free from the conflict of contrasting realities in both physical and metaphysical realms. You will not find even a single epoch in the history in which the falsehood has not been in a hostile confrontation with truth, or in which the upholders of truth have not been proving their existence to tear down the falsehood with intervention and assistance of the One True Being. You will discover that from Adam (PBUH) to the Prophet of the final times (PBUH) and thereafter his devotees in all the subsequent

periods have been giving a tough challenge to falsehood at every level in every field, regardless of whether it is a battle ground or academic debate, and then irrespective of the field of knowledge, science, art.

It is an interesting fact that Allah the Exalted always chooses those among his servants who are compatible with prevailing temperament, taste, intellectual capacity, academic and practical expertise of their respective periods of time. Then, He uses these chosen servants to defend his religion against evil forces in accordance to logical, intellectual, scientific, and practical requirements of that time. It is because in this constantly changing world, the methods of argumentation and reasoning, the criteria of acceptance and rejection, and mental and intellectual abilities keep going through changes, and so is going to be the case till the last day of the universe. However, since the objective, i.e. defense of religion, remains the same, the principles and primary concepts remain unchanged. The only change that takes place is in the method and approach, which is an inalienable part of ever-changing human nature.

It is also an undeniable fact that the history of humanity never lacked such great and proficient personalities who dedicated each and every moment of their life for the betterment of their community in terms of education, religion, morality, culture, and social life. Such capable and high-moral individuals are found at every point of time and place, either visibly or invisibly. Undoubtedly, the wide-ranging development of this moderate nation owes much to the services of these individuals.

Among the great individuals chosen for defense of Islam and betterment of generations, we find the name of the epitome of knowledge, action, efforts, sincerity,

patience, and consistency, the ever-ready personality for defense of Islam, the man fully conscious of background and foreground of his age, the peculiar and remarkable luminary, the founder of Darul Uloom Deoband, Ḥujjat al-Islām Ḥaḍrat Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānautavī (may Allah fill his grave with light). Ḥaḍrat Imām Nānautavī was not only an individual, rather his personage was multi-dimensional. He was a scholar, a spiritual teacher, a mujahid for the religion and freedom fighter for the country, a purifier of hearts, and an ocean of knowledge and wisdom. The convoy of the scholars of truth has been on voyage on the illuminated path shown by him for more than one and half century. The scholars whose sincere efforts for the sake of Allah and the effects of whose broad vision can clearly be felt and seen throughout this long period on national and international level. It includes the movement to establish Madrasas with the purpose of defending Islam which added a bright chapter to the history of Indian Muslims, and the embodiment of which is the establishment of Darul Uloom Deoband, and its historical, academic, ideological, and educational continuation is Darul Uloom Waqf Deoband.

The book in hand, Intiṣār al-Islām, is a representation of the same struggle of truth against falsehood that contains historical accounts of the same long-running conflict between truth and falsehood. Intiṣār al-Islām is not a product of proper authorship of the founder of Darul Uloom, rather it is an outcome of the logical objections raised by Pundit Dayanand against Islamic creeds. Actually, Pundit Dayanand openly raised these objections in Public at Roorkee and announced that he wants the answers only from Maulawī Qāsim in a face to

face debate and that he does not see any other scholar as his opponent. Ḥaḍrat Nānautavī, on the other side, was suffering from illness and weakness so severe that even a short journey was extremely difficult for him. Nevertheless, since he had spent his whole life in the defense of Islam, the same sentiment overcame all the visible obstacles, and the insistence by his contemporary scholars and devoted disciples fearing the temptation of common people triggered it further. At last, Ḥaḍrat Nānautavī set forth in the said state of weakness and illness relying on the assistance of the Almighty and left for Roorkee on foot. The night-long laborious journey ended on Fajar prayer.

During his seventeen days long stay in Roorkee, in spite of attempts through all means, the Pundit kept playing hide and seek and did not come face to face to fulfill his challenge. Actually, the Pundit was confident that Maulawī Qāsim is on bed rest due to his illness and I will not accept anyone else as my opponent for the debate, so on the one hand, this trick will win me reputation in my community and will humiliate the Muslims, and on the other, in the absence of answers, the philosophical objections raised by me will keep creating doubts in the minds of Muslims. Since refuting my objections on rational grounds is not easy for every other person, ultimately I will be deemed the winner.

"فَلَمَّا زَاغُوا أَزَاغَ اللَّهُ قُلُوبَهُمْ"

And when they deviated, Allah caused their hearts to deviate. [As-Saf, 61:5]

But things always happen as Allah wants them to be. His will and planning are always dominant.

وَقُلْ جَاءَ الْحَقُّ وَزَهَقَ الْبَاطِلُ إِنَّ الْبَاطِلَ كَانَ زَهُوقًا

And say, "Truth has come, and falsehood has departed. Indeed is falsehood, [by nature], ever bound to depart." [Al-Isra, 17:81]

In spite of all the attempts, the Pundit fled the battle field fearing his open defeat. However, his foul mouth became a reason of an extremely valuable addition to the realm of knowledge in the form of coherent and well thought out responses to the objections against Islam which has formed a sound methodological basis for future generations to defend Islam. This write-up has been enjoying an esteemed acknowledgement as the authorship of Ḥaḍrat Nānautavī by academic societies and scholarly circles for almost a century, which was first given the title 'Intiṣār al-Islām' by his dear disciple, Ḥaḍrat Mawlānā Fakhrul Ḥasan Gangohi.

All praise be to Allah! The director of Ḥujjat al-Islām Academy, the research wing of Darul Uloom Waqf Deoband, and the vice rector of the institution, Mawlānā Dr. Mohammad Shakaib Qāsmi, and his sincere and energetic teammates truly deserve compliments and appreciation for channeling their mental, academic, and youthful physical abilities into realizing the vast goals and wide-ranging objectives of the academy. Admittedly, they are contributing a lot to the fame and glory of the institution through their serious efforts, sincere attempts, and broadness of mind and vision. They have, in fact, opened for themselves the door of blessings and good fortune from the Almighty by truly recognizing the importance of time and making use of each and every moment and by respectively giving their best performance to achieve the

noble tasks. I always pray may the Almighty elevate their ambitions, facilitate the accomplishment of their given tasks, and make them a cause of popularity and pride of the institution.

The wide-ranging objectives behind establishment of Ḥujjat al-Islām Academy include translating the valuable treasure of knowledge and wisdom left by our predecessors into global and widely spoken languages along with editing, simplifying, and rephrasing their work in the light of modern methods and current academic requirements. Particularly, a special consideration is given to simplifying the noteworthy writings of Ḥaḍrat Nānautavī and translating them into Arabic and English as well as printing and publishing them in high quality in order to quench the thirst of the seekers and pass them on academic societies. As a whole, these attempts fulfill the duty of scholarship of Deoband in a very beautiful and appropriate manner. The endeavors of the Academy in this direction in the last five years have so far produced more than twenty five books of utmost significance and adorned with all the requirements of present-time and, in this short while, have won recognition and acclamation of renowned scholars, intellectuals, and academicians on national and international level who have expressed their appreciation both verbally and in writing. Apart from this, a number of academic projects are going on in different directions.

والله الموفق وهو يهدي السبيل.

Mohammad Sufyan Qāsmī
Rector, Darul Uloom Waqf Deoband
17th Safar, 1441 A.H/ 17th October, 2019

Preface (Urdu edition)

The writings of Ḥaḍrat Imām Qāsim Nānautavī (may Allah's blessings be upon him) have been critically and logically examined, scrutinized on the basis of narration and reason, and are the most remarkable part of his scholarship and refined learning which transformed the school of 'Deoband' to a scholastic and reformatory school of thought on the Indian soil disseminating the knowledge of the Holy Quran, Ḥadīth, Kalām, and Fiqh and fully in consistent with the straight path of the '*Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah*'. Any just researcher or writer who is studying and writing on the history of Islamic knowledge and sciences in the Indian context, now or in the future, cannot afford to ignore 'Deoband' and risk his efforts to be seen in the academic world as incomplete, partial, and unreliable.

On a historical turning point when Muslims of India were deprived of dominance and sovereignty, the God-gifted knowledge and insight of the Imām although emerged from defensive side, it is an undeniable fact that each and every word penned by him on the defensive front was inspired by his proactive liking of *da'wah* (inviting people to Islam) and intuited approach of investigation, and it acquainted the world with a new science of Kalām in compliance with the demands of that time.

The 'Majlis Ma'ārif al-Quran' is very fortunate that the long due wish of our elders for simplifying and

elucidating the thought-provoking knowledge of the Imām, the founder of Darul Uloom Deoband, is being realized through it. I firmly believe that this move of the Majlis with respect to the knowledge of the Imām will prove to be an addition of a new investigatory chapter on Islamic sciences for academic circles, and a valuable and inspiring asset for defensive as well as proactive efforts of those engaged in calling people to the true religion.

The keen interest of Ḥakīm al-Islam Ḥaḍrat Mawlānā Muḥammad Ṭayyib Qāsmī, the president of Majlis Ma‘ārif al-Quran and the rector of Darul Uloom Deoband in the authoring services of the Majlis and his precious, scholarly and intellectual guidance are in fact the cherished assets of the Majlis that have encouraged the Majlis to serve the distinguished knowledge of the pioneer of Deoband school of thought, Ḥaḍrat Imām Nānautavī. I pray that, in the future, academic circles could be able to provide a remedy for curious minds of present time using this new form of Kalām as their basis. The Majlis is immensely grateful to Ḥaḍrat Ḥakīm al-Islam for his scholarly guidance and Ḥaḍrat Mawlānā Ishtiyāq Aḥmad, professor of Darul Uloom Deoband, for his efforts of simplifying and explaining the knowledge of the Imām in this book, and is offering this invaluable asset to readers.

Muḥammad Salim Qāsmī
Former Professor
Darul Uloom Deoband

Commentator’s Note

The objections that Pandit Dayanand Saraswati used to publicly raise against the doctrines of Islam, after the visit of Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānautavī to Roorkee (where the Pandit was then propagating his fallacies) were ceased to some extent, and as the account of the events reads that even after repeated urging of Muslims, he did not agree on a debate and fled from Roorkee. The late Mawlānā then held public lectures for three days wherein he explained irrecusable answers to the Pandit’s objections before the public. The outcome of these efforts was satisfactory to the extent that the Pandit never dared again to use Roorkee as his playground, but this fear was still there that he would choose some other place to promulgate his delusions, which later came true. The Pandit reached Meerut and started to raise in public the same sort of nonsense objections. The Mawlānā followed him there and tried his best to persuade him for a public debate (the detailed account whereof is given in the prologue of “*Barāhīn-e-Qāsmiyya*”) but to no avail.

At the end, in order to put a permanent stop to his evil propaganda, the late Mawlānā penned down the responses to the objections that the Pandit used to raise in public so that he would not dare to open his mouth another time, and so that if the Pandit repeats his balderdash at any other place or occasion, then ordinary Muslims who are not capable to rise to his status and counter his philosophical objections can just confront him with this write-up.

It was imperative in the responses to keep them simple because the Pandit’s objections were for public which everyone could easily understand, so the responses too must have been simply intelligible which a layman and a well-educated could equally grasp and realize that those objections did not have slightest element of truth contrary to the boastful claims of this cult. For this reason, the author stated two answers for every question; first answer is sharp and witty, and easy to understand, and the second one is well-studied, detailed, and substantiated by rational arguments. This style has been followed throughout this book, and since “*Qiblā Numā*” is also continuation of this work, the same approach has been maintained therein.

The first edition of this work was published by Mawlānā Fakhrul Ḥasan Gangohi on Monday, 27th Rabī‘ al-Thānī, 1298 A.H. Later, other publishers followed the same edition, and due to lack of attention to revision and correction, a lot of errors found their way to this text. Now, the Majlis Ma‘ārif al-Quran took up the responsibility to rectify it and add headings and subheadings to appropriate places coupled with simplifying difficult matters and expounding the points that the author has put briefly aiming to keep the write-up concise. The commentary has been handwritten in a light tone and has been bordered with lines. If a word or sentence has been inserted in the original text, it is put in brackets so as to keep it distinguishable.

Glory be to Allah! This task was completed on Wednesday, 15th Muḥarram al-Ḥarām, 1387 A.H. I ask Allah the Almighty to accept this effort of mine.

Ishtiyāq Aḥmad
Former Professor
Darul Uloom Deoband

Introduction

I, Fakhrul Ḥasan, may Allah forgive me, state addressing to the readers of this book that this treatise which I have named “Intiṣār al-Islām” has been authored by the scholar of Islam, the upholder of Shariah, one of the signs of Allah, the evidence of Allah on the earth, the living manifestation of the Ḥadīth “scholars of my Ummah are like prophets of the children of Israel”, the heir of Allah’s messenger, the king of the pious, the pure saint, the warrior of Islam, Ḥājī, Ḥāfiz, and Maulawī, late Muḥammad Qāsim sb, may Allah forgive him and make paradise his eternal abode. The late Mawlānā wrote this book in the year 1295 A.H. in response to the objections raised by Pandit Dayanand Saraswati. The motive behind authoring this book (and the book ‘*Qiblā Numā*’ which may be regarded as a sequel to this work) is that Pandit Dayanand Saraswati came to Roorkee and began to openly raise objections against Islam. Since there was no able Muslim scholar in Roorkee who could answer the philosophical objections of the Pandit, he and his adherent Hindus found the ground abandoned and became very impudent.

Muslims of Roorkee informed the late Mawlānā about their audacity and that the Pandit appears every day in public to proclaim his philosophical objections, and firstly there is no such scholar in Roorkee who could engage in a philosophical debate, and secondly if a freshman or some Persian learned semi-scholar gathers courage to answer his objections, then the Pandit and his followers pay no attention to him and insist on not debating

with any unknowledgeable and layman, and they demand to have a debate with a senior scholar.

Letters with such content continued to arrive. Ḥaḍrat Nānautavī wanted to send any of his pupils or students of Deoband madrasa to confront the Pandit. Meanwhile, one more letter came from Roorkee which quoted the Pandit as saying that he will only debate with Maulawī Qāsim and not anyone else. The reason was probably that the Pandit saw that now he has built an image among his followers, so he should set a condition which leads to no debate, as the Mawlānā was sick at that time and the Pandit knew that he was not able to travel. When there would be no debate, his image will be secure.

Anyway, the Mawlānā was suffering from a high fever and dry cough so severe that he could hardly speak, and he was so weak that even walking few steps would cause him heavy breathing. All this sickness and weakness were remainder of the critical illness which he had caught during his way back from Mecca in that year. Compelled by this situation, the Mawlānā wrote to Muslims of Roorkee, "due to this sickness and weakness, I am unsure whether I can reach there, and even if I do come, I will not be able to talk. The cough is so terrible that it has made it impossible to complete my sentences. Therefore, I seek your excuse but I can send some people from here who can challenge the Pandit, destroy his arguments, and will be a showstopper for him." In response to this letter, the Muslims of Roorkee wrote, "the Pandit insists on not talking to anyone except Maulawī Qāsim". Now, the Mawlānā ordered me, Maulawī Mahmood Ḥasan, and Maulawī Ḥāfiz Abdul 'Adl to go to Roorkee and get the

ground report, and if the Pandit agrees to talk then to finish this task too. The three of us made preparations to go to Roorkee, took Maulawī Manẓūr Aḥmad Jawalapuri with us, and on Thursday before Maghrib we four fellows started our journey on foot. We offered Maghrib prayer in gardens around Deoband and walked the whole night to enter Roorkee in the early morning. We met some local Muslims and after Friday prayer we four fellows, accompanied by some local people, went to the Pandit's bungalow which was located at the border of the cantonment. One of our accompanying locals told the Pandit to get the answer of his objections from us and that it was the sole purpose of our visit. To which the Pandit replied, "I do not want to listen and I do not have time either. Neither I want to discuss it nor did I challenge for any debate in any advertisement. I am not aware if someone has printed any such advertisement without my knowledge." We insisted our level best but the Pandit did not agree. During this exchange of words, many a times the Pandit was caught off guard and was left astonished. At the end, we asked him whether he is ready to have a debate with Mawlānā Qāsim or not even with him. The Pandit replied, "I am not willing to do it myself, but if the Mawlānā comes here, I will be convinced to have a debate. However, I will not engage in dialogue with anyone else at any cost." Upon our inquiry about the reason, he said, "I travelled the entire Eastern India and then went across the whole Punjab, I heard every learned man praising him and calling him unparalleled, and I myself have listened to his fascinating speech in the conference of Shahjahanpur. If one is to have a debate, he should have it with such a competent and peerless person, only then he could get some benefit or reach a conclusion."

At the end, we returned and spent that night in the city and left for Deoband in the early morning. In the evening, we reached Mawlānā's place and narrated the course of events.

Two or three days later, again a letter came from Muslims of Roorkee, repeating the same insistence on the Mawlānā's visit and the complaint about the audacity of the Pandit and his followers. Now, the Mawlānā agreed to visit and wrote back asking them to decide a date for debate with the Pandit and to inform him. They responded saying that the Pandit is asking the Mawlānā to visit first and decide a date by himself, and that he is not ready to speak to us in this regard.

Finally, the Mawlānā and the four of us left for Roorkee in the beginning of Sha'bān accompanied by Ḥājī Muḥammad 'Ābid and Ḥakīm Mushtāq Aḥmad. It was summer time so we walked the whole night and reached Roorkee in the early morning. Ecstatic and overjoyed flocks of local Muslims began to come and meet the Mawlānā, and the entire Roorkee became aware of his arrival. Negotiation on setting the terms of debate commenced in writing. The Mawlānā was accommodated in the city and the Pandit was quartered in cantonment. The Pandit remained stubborn for few days; he did not agree to come to the ground of debate and kept on making silly excuses. In the end, he got apprehensive even in writing and conveyed to us that "the Mawlānā writes a lot and merely going through it exhausts us (the Pandit and his adherents), we are not left with any other work. So, no new write-up should come after today, or else we will not respond to it". Meanwhile, Maulawī Iḥsanullah, a resident of Meerut, came to Mawlānā and stated that the colonel he works for as steward and a captain are eager to meet him, and

they want to ask him some questions about religion. Mawlānā said that this is what we have come for, this is a golden opportunity, and I am ready to go whenever you want.

Next day, Mawlānā went to the colonel's bungalow along with some of his companions. The colonel and captain both welcomed him. Mawlānā sat on a chair and the colonel first expressed his gratitude and said, "I have heard a lot about your knowledge and mastery and I was eager to meet you, it is our honor that you have visited us". Then he asked, "There are many religions in the world and everyone considers his religion as true, so according to you which religion is the true religion?" Mawlānā said, "The only true religion upon which one's salvation depends is the religion of Islam". Then he presented such astonishing evidences which left the colonel and the captain dumbfounded. Thereafter, the colonel asked, "When Islam is the only true religion, why God did not make everyone Muslim"? Again, the answer of Mawlānā amazed the colonel and captain and they started to sing the praises of his mastery and depth of knowledge.

Subsequently, the colonel asked the reason of not raining, as the major part of monsoon season that year passed without rainfall, and there was fear of famine. And then the colonel himself added, "Our European philosophers say that it is because the sun has become old and battered; it is no longer hot enough to cause evaporation of water and then convert it to raindrops". Mawlānā invalidated the reason given by European philosophers and proved the actual cause being the bad deeds of humankind.

The arguments of Mawlānā on that occasion are worth listening, but transcribing them in full requires a

whole separate treatise. I am, therefore, leaving those details and narrating the subsequent events.

Following this, the colonel summoned the Pandit, and he came. The colonel asked the Pandit, “Why do you not have a debate in public with the Mawlānā?” The Pandit replied that he fears a disturbance if it is held in public. The captain offered to hold the debate at his bungalow and that he will handle the disturbance. The Pandit replied that he will only have a discussion at his own bungalow and that too not in a crowd. Upon this, the Mawlānā said, “There is no crowd here, only ten to twelve persons are around. So, you pose your objections and I will answer”. The Pandit replied that he did not come here intending to have a discussion. Mawlānā replied, “You may make an intention now, either I will raise objections against your religion and you answer, or you raise the objections and we will respond”. However, the Pandit did not agree on any point. Conditions for debate were also brought up but to no avail. Finally, the meeting was concluded and the Mawlānā came back to his accommodation. For next few days, exchange and negotiation on the conditions of debate continued, and at last the Mawlānā asked the Pandit to have a debate at any place; in market, in public, in private, or before nobles, but to have it at any rate.

The Pandit agreed to have debate at his bungalow and put a condition that the audience should not exceed two hundred individuals. The Mawlānā was preparing to leave for his bungalow but the government announced a ban on holding debate in the cantonment area ordering to conduct it anywhere else.

The Mawlānā wrote to the Pandit and asked him to hold it near the river or the ground for Eid prayer or any of his desired location. Nevertheless, the Pandit took

advantage of this situation and kept on insisting on coming to his bungalow. Since the government had announced a ban, the Mawlānā could not go to his bungalow and the Pandit was not ready to come out. This drama was still going on when the Mawlānā ordered us to stand up in the middle of the market and challenge the Pandit to come out of his bungalow and face us like a man. He also ordered us to publicly pronounce answers to the objections raised by the Pandit.

Since this was not such a difficult task that Maulawī Mahmood Ḥasan and Maulawī Ḥāfiz Abdul ‘Adl were needed to be bothered, I carried this out; I answered the objections raised by the Pandit in the market, in full public view. Additionally, I posed numerous objections against the new religion of the Pandit and challenged his self-respect. Although many of his adherents were in the crowd, they never dared to say anything in response neither they felt ashamed so that they could drag the Pandit to the battlefield. We also pasted such posters all over the market.

Eventually, the Mawlānā conveyed a message to the Pandit that if you do not want to debate, it is up to you, but we are going to give a public lecture. You should at least come with your pupils and adherents to attend it. Nonetheless, as a poet says:

کب وہ سنتا ہے کہانی میری   اور پھر وہ بھی زبانی میری[1]

The Pandit not only remained absent from the lecture, but he also fled from Roorkee and left no trace behind.

In the subsequent event, the Mawlānā himself delivered public lectures for three consecutive days.

1 Translation: How can he listen to my story, And that too from my mouth!

Muslims, Hindus, and Christians of Roorkee and all junior and senior English officers and people of all groups attended those lectures. The evidences presented by Mawlānā on the truth of Islam left the audience stunned. Silence was prevailing and everyone seemed impressed. The irrecusable answers of the Pandit’s objections compelled even the opponents to surrender. Especially, the mesmerizing ambience during his elucidation of *Tawḥīd* (oneness of God) and *Risālat* (messengership of Muḥammad PBUH) was beyond words. Only those who listened with their ears would know that feel.

قدر ایں مے نشناسی بخدا تانہ چشی[2]

Among Muslims, those who were spiritually enlightened got thrilled and were writhing like a slaughtered animal. In those three lectures, the Mawlānā proved to the followers of all faiths that the evasion from eternal torment of the hereafter is impossible without embracing Islam. He did not only establish the evidence of God but also perfected it. If someone still chooses the hellfire, he will be responsible for it.

نہ مانے آتش دوزخ میں جائے جس کا جی چاہے[3]

And

بر رسولاں بلاغ باشد وبس[4]

Thereafter, on 23rd Sha‘bān, the Mawlānā departed from Roorkee, spent one day in Manglaur, and the following day reached Deoband. Three days later, he arrived at Nanauta and wrote down the answers to the Pandit’s objections which

2 Translation: You will not know the worth of this wine until you taste it yourself.

3 Translation: If not ready to accept, one is free to go to hellfire.

4 Translation: The messengers are only responsible to convey.

were eleven in total. Since the objection regarding prostrating towards the holy Kaaba was very lengthy and extensive, the author himself had parted it as a separate treatise and had named it "*Qiblā Numā*" (Qibla indicator). As for the answers of other ten objections, he had compiled them in a separate piece of writing but he had not given it a name. I, thus, named it "*Intiṣār al-Islām*" (the victory of Islam). Its another name is "*Jawābāt Dandān Shikan*" (the irrecusable answers). This name was also mentioned to the Mawlānā, and its Hindi name is "Pandit ki katha mein khandat" (a spanner in the Pandit's works). The treatise "*Qiblā Numā*" is the answer to only one objection while "*Intiṣār al-Islām*" contains the answers to ten objections, and due to relevance I have also included the response to the Pandit's objection on the actuality of paradise and hell which he posed in the debate of Shahjahanpur as well as the speech of the Mawlānā on proving angels and jinn as objective reality (*mawjūd-e-khārjī*) which he delivered there.

This write-up also contains the clarification of Sir Syed Aḥmad Khan's doubts, since in some matters he shares the same views with the Pandit; both deny the objectivity of Satan, jinn, and angels, as well as the actuality of paradise and hell. If Sir Syed Aḥmad and those on his ideology have an unbiased look at this discourse, then we hope, by the grace of God, their all doubts will be cleared and they will accept the objectivity of Satan, will no more be doubtful about physical reality of jinn and angels, and will acknowledge the actuality of paradise and hell. Further, they will prepare to enter paradise and will be fearful of hell. And Allah guides whom He wills to a straight path.[5]

5 Al-Nur, 24:46.

Sir Syed Aḥmad Khan denied the objectivity of Satan, jinn, angels, paradise, and hell in addition to giving twisted interpretation of the miracles of prophets in his *tafsīr* (commentary) of *Sūrah al-Baqarah*. I have written its refutation which is about to finish. If God is willing, and the publication is arranged, it will soon be published and served to the readers.

Overall, though "*Intiṣār al-Islām*" is strange, "*Qiblā Numā*" is bizarre. For centuries, perhaps, no ear has got to listen to such high valued contents, nor has any eye seen. I am incapable of putting its merit into words, the readers would themselves find out. By God's will, soon "*Qiblā Numā*" is also going to be made public. Other writings of the Mawlānā which are yet to be published, and their number reaches to almost hundred, I have determined to bring them out hoping divine assistance. Ameen!

It is extremely saddening that the world has been deprived of such a profound and peerless scholar of Islam. The demise of such an upholder of Shariah who was always ready to sacrifice not only his own life but the lives of his loved ones for the sake of protecting Shariah is heartbreaking. We have lost a gardener of the garden of Islam who was ever-ready to protect, nurture, and serve this garden. Who will now edge its pathways and will take care of the straight path! Who will prune the garden bed to rid it of stem and stalk of doubts! Nothing remains in our hands except regret and grief. Indeed, everything belongs to Allah and to Him we shall return. None has lived forever nor anyone will, except One True Eternal Being who has no beginning and no end.

The late Mawlānā left numerous students and devotees behind. Now, it is their responsibility to be a

mirror image of the Mawlānā and to not care about their life, wealth, honor, and status to fight with the enemies of Allah (SWT) and his prophet (PBUH). They should refrain from indulging in internal conflicts, and should protect the religion of Islam up to their capacity. I am also among his students, and although the lowest of them, regard this association with him as my pride.

بلبل ہمیں کہ قافیہ گل شود بس است[6]

I just ask God the Exalted to bestow prosperity on Islam and Muslims, forgo our sins, elevate us from inferiority to the throne of superiority, make Islam predominant, and subjugate the foes of faith.

I have also compiled a biography of the late Mawlānā in which I have recounted the exceptional events of his life, his extraordinary achievements, and various accounts of his knowledge and practice which demonstrate his incomparability in exoteric (*ẓāhirī*) as well as esoteric (*bāṭinī*) sciences. In addition, I have also highlighted the souvenirs of various kinds left by the late Mawlānā. The purpose of this compilation and recounting is that someone may muster up the courage and put some efforts in following his footsteps; he may benefit from these invaluable discourses and extend it to others. This biography is worth giving it a read as there may hardly be any other thing more phenomenal. Since this biography has become an entire book, it is difficult to publish it at the moment. However, if God is willing, this dream will also come true.

---

6 Translation: It is enough for "bulbul" (the nightingale) that it rhymes with "gul" (flower).

Objection no. 1

Muslims claim that God is omnipotent and absolutely powerful (*qādir muṭlaq*). However, God cannot kill Himself neither can He steal, hence proving that He is not absolutely powerful.

Answer (1)

If God is not omnipotent and absolutely powerful (*qādir muṭlaq*), then He must have restricted powers (i.e. he must be *qādir muqayyad*). And if he has restricted powers then there must be someone above him who is absolutely powerful. Because, firstly, it is agreed upon by all rational people that for every 'restricted concept' (*muqayyad*), there must be an 'absolute concept' (*muṭlaq*).[7] Secondly, even if we keep this agreement (of all rational people) aside, every sane mind will apparently testify in favor of this principle. To elaborate, putting restriction is actually another name for fragmentation (fragmentation: to split into pieces, to separate a portion). The fragmentation signifies separation of a small fragment from a bigger thing. Therefore, if this

7 'Absolute concept' or '*Muṭlaq'*: A conception which does not have any restriction or limitation. 'Restricted concept' or '*Muqayyad'*: A conception which is bound by some restriction or condition. For every restricted concept there must be an absolute concept. For example, every human being is animal (*ḥaiwān*). That is to say, the reality of human being, i.e. rational animal (*ḥaiwān nāṭiq*), will be established when the restriction of being rational (*nāṭiq*) will be attached to the absolute conception of animal (*ḥaiwān*). Therefore, for the existence of this restricted reality (i.e. rational animal), the pre-existence of the absolute conception of animal is a pre-requisite, the domain of which is broader than the domain of 'rational animal'.

fragmentation and separation take place in 'universal concepts' (*kulliyyāt*),[8] then that separated fragment will be called 'restricted' since it has undergone fragmentation and has come in the restriction of a form that was acquired by separation. And that bigger thing, considering that it is free from that restriction, will be called 'absolute' because absolute is something which is free from restrictions.

In short, every restricted concept requires an absolute reality as it is evident by reasoning and by unanimity of rational people. Therefore, if God is not absolutely powerful then He will be powerful with some restrictions, and in that case, one will have to believe in another absolutely powerful being.

Furthermore, since it is necessary for the omnipotent God, in the view of the Pandit, to have power to take life of others and himself alike, as it is apparent by his objection, He (the omnipotent God who is supposedly above the restricted powerful) will have potency to take life of the God and the life of his Own self. Moreover, when He has power to, God forbid, kill the God, he should be potent to give life to God as well.[9] Rather, one will have to say that the God was created and brought into being by him,[10]

8 *Kullī* or universal concept: is a general conception or content which encompasses many members, species, or genus, and a member of this universal concept is called particular (*juz'ī*).

9 When one has believed him as such absolute powerful, he will have to believe his potency to give life as well. Otherwise, one has to reject His absolute power and this will bring back the objection of limited power.

10 There is no other meaning of giving life than rendering one the attribute of life out of the treasure of attributes of existence. Similarly, the meaning of taking life is to negate that attribute. Further, the sources of give and take do not differ. Therefore,

because one can only take away the attribute that was given by him and not the attribute given by someone else. The sun, which lightens the earth, can deprive it of the light by taking it away from the earth. The moon cannot take away this offering of the sun.[11] Apparently, since existence and life both are attributes, whoever takes them away will be considered to be the giver of these attributes. In this case, however, His status as God will not remain very Godly, rather it will become akin to the kingship in the game of

---

negation also points to the source of life; the one who negated the life, was also the source of it.

11 This objection should not be raised here that, at the time of solar eclipse, the moon takes the light away by blocking it from reaching the earth, because it could be termed 'to take away' only if the light had elevated from the earth to the moon. In that case, the target of the light would have changed from the earth to the moon. This is similar to the case when, after making a shelter or a roof, the target of the solar light changes to that shelter or roof. It is not that the light comes from the source, i.e. the sun, to the earth and then it is taken away by the shelter or roof, rather the shelter or the roof is now the direct target for light. Now, the earth is no more the target for light because the condition for being the direct target, i.e. not being blocked by something, does not persist anymore.

Furthermore, this objection should not be raised too that if Zaid kills Omar then he has taken away his life, although the life was not given by him. The reason is that, in this case, the action of 'taking away' has actually been performed by Allah the Almighty who is the giver of that life. Zaid is only a medium and the predator, just like sword, for example, is a tool of Zaid. Since Zaid has been given a free will, the murder is considered his own act and he is subjected to prosecution, but the sword, which is merely an object that does not have any will power, is not held responsible for the murder. All in all, the murder and taking the life away are two different actions, although they are inseparable and successive in their occurrence. The former has been committed by Zaid and the latter by the same Being who was the giver of the life, i.e. the Almighty Allah.

chess.[12] In short, not believing him as omnipotent and absolutely powerful is such an absurd idea that it leads to rejection of God's Godhood[13] and not only his absolute powers.

Answer (2)

Every action or effect requires an actor or effective performer and an acted upon or passive object (which accepts the effects). In fact, only that can be a passive object which has the capability of accepting the effect. Just as effective performers are sometimes higher and sometimes lower in their level of effectiveness, passive objects are also high at times and low at others in their acceptance of effects. However, neither total or partial loss of the passive's capability can be a cause of total or partial

---

12 That he can be struck by any chess piece, and once struck, left his place and sought refuge at any other place, and gave up on life if could not find any refuge. The whole game of kingship turned upside down.

The summary of argument: The common sense requires that God must be self-standing, because if he is not believed to be absolutely powerful then it will be must to believe that his powers are restricted. In that case, it will be inevitable to believe another Deity above him who must have absolute power. According to your hypothesis, the absolute power must be inclusive of negating God's existence, hence his existence ought to be granted by some other Being, without any doubt. The inference is that God depends on someone else for His existence and life; He is not self-standing, which is impossible. This impossible inference has been caused by assuming restricted powers. Therefore, having restricted power is also impossible, for what leads to impossible is also impossible itself.

13 Godhood solely depends on the quality of being self-standing, that is, his existence must be of his own, not given by others. A detailed discussion of this can be read in *Barāhīn-e-Qāsmiyyah*.

loss of the effectiveness of the effective performer[14] nor the absence or scarcity of the effectiveness of the effective performer can be a cause of absence or scarcity of the ability of passiveness.[15]

For instance (in the 1st form as an actor), the sun is effective in illuminating the earth and the skies, and (as an

---

14 It means that if the passive does not have the ability to accept effects or lacks the adequacy of this ability, this inability and inadequacy cannot lead to absence or scarcity of the effectiveness in the effective performer.

15 That is, if the effective performer does not have the effectiveness or lacks the adequacy of this ability, this ineffectiveness and inadequacy cannot result in disappearance or scarcity of the ability to accept the effect in the passive object.

It should be noted that if we put the adequacy, inadequacy, or loss of effectiveness in the effective performer together with the adequacy, inadequacy, or loss of passiveness in the passive object, the following nine forms will appear.

1	effectiveness of effective performer	adequate	acceptance of effect by passive object	adequate
2	〃	〃	〃	inadequate
3	〃	〃	〃	absent
4	〃	inadequate	〃	adequate
5	〃	〃	〃	inadequate
6	〃	〃	〃	absent
7	〃	absent	〃	adequate
8	〃	〃	〃	inadequate
9	〃	〃	〃	absent

Out of these, the fifth and the sixth forms, wherein there is attribution of inadequacy to the effective performer coupled with the attribution of inadequacy and absence to the passive, and the eighth and ninth forms, wherein there is absence on the part of the effective performer and the opposite, the passive, also has inadequacy and absence, these forms are out of discussion. Other five forms (1, 2, 3, 4, and 7) are probable. For every probability, some appropriate thing from the sides of the effective performer or the passive can be taken and used to check the adequacy and inadequacy of effectiveness or passiveness.

object) mirror is passive. One is actor, another is acted upon. The sun is a perfect effective performer in illuminating, and the mirror is a perfect passive object in getting illuminated (meaning that the actor and the passive both are perfect).

But imagine if (as in the 2nd form, the actor is the sun and the passive) instead of the mirror is a stone; it will indeed be a deficiency on the part of the passive. And if suppose (as in the 3rd form, the actor is the sun, and the passive) instead of the mirror is spirit, air, or sound (it will be non-acceptance on the passive's part, because spirit, air, and sound are not capable of accepting the light from the sun). But in both forms (2nd and 3rd), the quality of illuminating and effectiveness of the sun are not affected, they remain as it is. By the same logic, if it is a mirror this side, and (as in the 7th from, on the side of the actor) there is a black disc, then the ability of mirror is at no fault; the absence of effectiveness of the black disc is (the reason for no effect). And if (as in the 4th form) instead of the sun, there is moon or lamp, (and the passive is a mirror) then the ability of the mirror is still the same but the effectiveness of the actor is weak compared to the sun.

Coming back to the point that the absolute power is free from any weakness: after the case has been well introduced, now listen! *'Qādir'* is active participle of *'qudrat'* (power), and *'maqdūr'* is the one that gets affected by the power (or that is under the power); it is passive participle of *qudrat*. If God is on one side and probables (*mumkināt*) on the other, then the active and the passive both are perfect. And if probables are on one side and on the other side, assume in place of God any of His creations,

such as angel, jinn, or human being, then (similar to the example no. 4 of moon or lamp) the passive will remain perfect but there will be weakness of effectiveness on the active's part. And if (like the example no. 7 of black disc) you assume some inanimate object like stone, then it will be loss of effectiveness.

If the active participle of power, *qādir*, is God, and the other side, instead of probable, is impossible-by-itself (*muḥāl-e-dhātī*), then the active's ability will remain perfect (i.e. it will not affect the absoluteness of power) and it will be inefficiency on the passive's part.[16] And if there are,

---

16 Whatever we see or perceive, is confined to these two words; 'is' and 'is not'. Then what comes under 'is' has some more possibilities, either it has the possibility to become 'is not' or it does not have this possibility. If it has the possibility to become 'is not', it is called 'general probable' (*mumkin 'ām*, whose opposite side, i.e. 'is not', is not necessary) (The definition of necessary: necessary is something which cannot be negated, i.e. the intellect does not allow to negate it, like 'one' is half of 'two'). If it does not have the possibility of becoming 'is not', then there will be two more situations; either becoming 'is not' will be unacceptable to intellect due to its inherent nature, in this case it will be called 'necessary-by-itself' (*wājib bil dhāt*), or by nature it had the ability to become 'is not' but due to some external factor, its negation is unacceptable to intellect. In that case, it will be called 'necessary-by-external-factor' (*wājib bil ghair*).

Similarly, there are few possibilities in 'is not'. That is, the thing which is 'is not' at the moment may become 'is' or may not become. If it may become 'is' then it is 'specific probable' (*mumkin khās*; in this probable, the negation from both sides is necessary, i.e. neither its existence is necessary nor its non-existence). If it cannot become 'is', that is, it does not have the ability to become 'is', like concurrence of two contradictory ideas or being 2+2=5, then it is called 'impossible-by-itself' (*muḥāl bil dhāt*), and if becoming 'is' is not impossible by itself but the intellect rejects its occurrence due to some external factor then that is 'impossible-by-external-factor' (*muḥāl bil ghair*), like

instead of probable and impossible-by-itself, impossible-by-external-factor, then *qādir* will still remain perfect, but it will be weakness on the passive's part.

If an impossible does not come into existence via God's power (i.e. God's power does not bring impossible into being), it is not a fault of God's power and His ability. The impossibles do not have the potential to become *maqdūr*.[17]

Thus, what appears from the objection of the Pandit is that he is unaware of this difference.[18] The death of God is not *maqdūr* because it is impossible. But in what way does it affect the absoluteness of His power that you do not regard Him as omnipotent and absolutely powerful?

Answer to the objection of stealing: As far as the objection of stealing is concerned, its answer can also be inferred from this well-presented argument. To elaborate,

---

attribution of God with an, God forbid, unpleasant quality. (The difference between 'impossible-by-itself' and 'impossible-by-external-factor' is only of interpretation and division; otherwise both are same in not occurring ever).

17 Every attribute has a scope in which it works. For example, the faculty of hearing works in the scope of things which can be heard; its work is to hear sounds and not to see things. If ears cannot see things that can be seen, it is not regarded as their fault. The faculty of sight works in the scope of visible things; its work is to see things that are viewable, not to hear sounds. If eyes cannot hear sounds, it is not termed as a fault. Similarly, the scope of power is within *maqdūrāt* i.e. probable. If it does not focus on impossible, it should not even be doubted to be its fault since impossible is already out of its scope and, by nature, has no ability to enter a foreign scope.

18 He is not aware that perfection and deficiency of the active is a different thing and perfection and deficiency of the passive is different. That is why he mistook the fault of being *maqdūr* for the fault of being *qādir*.

stealing requires that there should be something which does not belong to him, and it is not possible for God as everything in the universe belongs to Him. Whatever a person earns by employing himself, is attributed to him just for name sake, and it is said that he has created this wealth. But the actual creator is God who has created it in reality. Then how will He not be the owner of that wealth? When it is so, there exists no such thing which does not belong to Him, and the passive side, i.e. the wealth that can be stolen, which is required to perform stealing, is missing (as in the 3rd form of the above table).

In short, here also the fault is not of the power of God, but the *maqdūr* is missing.

Objection no. 2

Muslims say that Satan misleads humans to make them do evil things, but we ask then who misled the Satan? To be precise, this belief is wrong. Satan is nothing; human does evil things by himself.

Answer (1)

Proving Satan's existence: Being doubtful in Satan's existence and his misleading just because you don't find someone who misled Satan, is same as if you are doubtful that the fire heats up the water and the sun illuminates the earth just because there is no one who heated up the fire and lightened up the sun. If this is the only reason, then you must deny the existence of fire and the sun, and you should consider heating up of water by fire and lighting up of earth by the sun false too. Rather, taking into account that there is no creator for God, you must deny His existence as well, and

must call it wrong to regard the universe a creation of God. In this case also, you should say that just as human does all evil things by himself, so do all creations come into existence by themselves; there is no creator.

Answer (2)

Explanation of expansion of attributes: The form of expansion of attributes (*auṣāf*) is that there is one 'self-characterized' (*mauṣūf bil-dhāt*) that is the source of an attribute, for which the attribute is innate, and others derive their characteristics from it. The form of expansion of the attribute of existence was that God is 'self-existent' (*maujūd bi-dhāt*), and he is the source of existence. His existence is innate (i.e. it is his personal entity, not given by others), and everyone besides Him derives his existence from Him.

The form of expansion of heat was that fire is hot by its nature and is the source of heat. Hot water and others benefit from its heat. The form of expansion of light was that the sun is illuminated by its nature and is the source of light. Light is inherent in its nature and everything besides the sun benefits from it.[19]

The heat we see in the sun and the light in the fire is because they both share the same substance. The only

19 If it is proven that the sun is illuminated from any other source of light, as claimed by European philosophers and some Muslims, it still does not make any difference to our argument. In that case, we will use that source in the example.

But then there will be one question that in your view self-characterized is only one, not many, and all the things characterized with that characteristic benefit from that self-characterized. However, our observation is that apart from fire, the sun is also a source of heat. So, the sources of heat are more than one. Similarly, we see light in the fire and thus, the source of light is also not only the sun; it is also more than one. To this underlying question, the author responded with the upcoming text.

difference is in the level of purity of that substance. This is same case as wax candles and camphor candles, or gas torch and mustard torch share the same substance but the clarity of their lights is distinctly different. Like in this case, despite the above mentioned difference, the source of heat and the source of light both are fire.[20] In the similar way, the sun and fire have the same substance in common, and the source of heat and source of light is the same thing at both places.[21]

The self-characterized for every characteristic is always one: self-characterized is always one but its characteristic expands in such a way that many things benefit from it and get characterized with that characteristic.[22]

20 In the clear light and heat of wax candle and comparatively less clear light and heat of the torch lit up with mustard oil, the substance and source of light and heat at both places is nothing other than fire. But the difference between both lights is because, in one of these, the matter is wax, and in another, it is oil.

21 But in the sun, that substance is produced by something extremely subtle, while in fire, (it is produced by) solid matters such as wood and oil. This is the reason that brightness of the sun is so luminous that it became the source of light for the moon, stars, and all other objects in the universe. Therefore, the connection of light with the sun is intrinsic, while with others it is extrinsic. Fire has been declared the source of heat since it is nearer to us, its effects on other things come more often in our observation compared to the sun, and it is more useful for us. It is worth remembering that cinder or different colored flame is all different forms of fire. Fire, by its nature, is abstract and colorless, and it is present in everything. Even in the water, it is present in a certain limit. Various degrees of thermometer are proof of this. In short, the matter is same in the fire and the sun, which is the source of heat here and the source of light there. Hence, our claim of singularity of source remains uncontested.

22 Up to this point, it was introduction to the intended argument, and thereafter, the main argument starts.

Satan is self-characterized with misguidance: Among other attributes, one is the characteristic of misguidance. Its expansion also takes place in this way that there is one self-characterized, and everyone else takes this characteristic from him and enters the circle of misguided lot. We call that self-characterized Satan, and the misguided lot attributed with this characteristic that took this from him we regard them, therefore, misguided.

Explanation of a doubt: But some simple-headed may raise this doubt that if Satan's evilness is from God then one will have to believe God as evil. Otherwise, he will have to believe Satan as God. To elaborate, if his personal trait, i.e. misguidance, is not from God, it will mean that it is not a creation of God. And when this trait is not a creation of God, Satan's personality cannot be God's creation as well.

Separation between personality and personal attribute is not possible: It is because separation between personality and personal attribute is not possible in any way. (If you accept that Satan's personality is a creation of God then) It is apparent that when the personality of Satan is a creation of God, and the attribute of misguidance is not God's creation, then misguidance must have been extrinsic. In this case, firstly, being self-characterized with misguidance would be proven wrong, and secondly, this characteristic would not have been with him when he was first created.

Answer to this doubt; difference between issuance and creation: (Since the above doubt was raised) that is why we state that issuance (*ṣudūr*) and creation (*khalq*) are two different things. If the sun is facing a window, the sunlight

passes through that window, falls on the ground, and forms a shape of the window with the light on the floor. This said light can be termed as issued from the sun, but the shape cannot be said coming from the sun. Otherwise, you will have to call the shape an attribute of the sun, just like the light. However, you can say that this shape is created because of the sun.

To sum up, creation is a different thing from issuance. For creation, the thing which is going to be created should be non-existent beforehand. Even money is termed as created when it is actually earned, just because it is non-existent in the beginning and is created for name sake. Whereas for issuance, the thing which is going to be issued should have firstly existed in the source, then only it is issued. Hence, all goodness is issued from God and all evils have been created by Him. This is the reason why we can say that ugly faces, evil natures, unpleasant sounds, and bodily wastes are creation of God. If things would have come from God in the case of ‘creation’ like they do in the case of ‘issuance’, these things could not have been the creation of God. And when these things can be His creations, what is so special about Satan that his creation would be perceived wrong. If creation was wrong because of his evilness, this reason is present elsewhere too (then why this objection is not raised there that creation of those things brings bad name to God).

Objection no. 3

Muslims believe that revocation (*naskh*) takes place in divine commandments. But this is totally against logic, because it implies that God said something today without giving it a thought and tomorrow, upon realizing His

mistake, changed the rule. God's commands are not similar to that of men. His commands always remain the same; they do not need any change or alteration.

Answer (1)

Revocation of commandments complies with logic: If change and alteration in God's commandments is against logic, then change and alteration in God's intentions is also against logic. If change of commandment is wrong because it will lead to associating God with misunderstanding, the same thing applies to the change of intention as well, since intention also depends on understanding just like the commandment. To explain, we give a command after having a certain level of understanding in our mind, in the same way, we make intention after having a certain level of understanding in our heart. When this is the case, negating after making existent, taking away life after giving it, sickening after giving health, making suffer after giving ease, and the vice versa would also be impossible from God because all these things happen with God's intention. Therefore, if he makes a different intention after making one, this will make you say that God made earlier intention without giving it a thought.

Answer (2)

An old commandment is sometimes changed due to mistake and sometimes due to change of people's interest (*maṣlaḥat*). A physician sometimes makes an incorrect diagnosis and so, after realizing his mistake, changes the prescription, and sometimes he changes the old prescription due to change in patient's condition or completion of a medication's course. In case of Meningitis during fever, due to change in patient's condition,

the prescription is changed. Similarly, the purgatives prescribed after completing the course of coctives, and this change is due to completion of first medication’s course. Nonetheless, the change in both of these situations is not because of realization of mistake. Thus, the change in divine commandments is of this type, not the other type. But the silly objector is not aware of these two situations, so he is excused.

Objection no. 4

Muslims believe that souls pre-exist and stay near God. One of them comes to this world when He orders it to come. But this is not true. Rather, God is all-time powerful to create and send any soul whenever He wants. Moreover, the total number of souls is 4.5 billion, and they are rewarded or punished through reincarnation.

Answer (1)

Analysis of objection: This objection comprises three elements:

Firstly, God always possesses the power to create souls then what is the need of believing their pre-existence?

Secondly, the total number of souls is 4.5 billion. The purpose of objector by this, perhaps, is that according to Muslims’ belief the number of souls should be higher, as they do not believe in reincarnation. In this case, the souls which have come once to this world do not come again. But if this is true, then the number of humans and other living beings would be more than 4.5 billion at every given moment.

Thirdly, the reincarnation, and the second point should be taken as the preface to this one. If reincarnation is true, the Day of Judgement will be proved a made-up story.

In short, actual objections are two, and the second element is only a preface for the third one, or the third point is an extension of the second one. Therefore, we are required to answer all three points, so that the answers can fit every probability.

Answers: The answer to the first point is that if being powerful all the time requires God not to create anything before its need arises, then, God forbid as per the belief of the Pandit, God does things totally against logic. He creates the whole crops and fruits in their respective seasons which are then consumed throughout the year based on needs. The appropriate way would be to create only when someone needs it. Similarly, there is nothing between heavens and the earth which is unnecessary, and everything is available much more than required and before the need arises. Land, water, air etc. everything is available in excess and beforehand. In one way or another, this excess amount is what we resort to at the time of need.

As for the second point, the answer to this is that only mosquitoes and insects in a small village will surely be more than 4.5 billion. If they cannot trust us, the Pandit and his followers may do the counting. If the number of souls is believed 4.5 billion, and those souls are connected with every living body, no sane person will accept this figure. Yes, if you put the logic aside then anything can be accepted.

The answer to the third point is that if reincarnation is for the purpose of reward and punishment, as appears from the objection and as believed by Hindus, then this is a strange kind of reward and punishment that neither the one getting reward knows for what he is being rewarded nor the punished is informed what he is suffering the punishment

for. Even if the Pandit had remembered that he was in such and such situation before this, and due to the reward of this or the punishment of that he came again to suffer from hardship, sickness, and difficulties of life, even then we would not have accepted it as a general rule. Even if it was believable, it would have been accepted about the reward and punishment of the Pandit alone. But the irony is that the reward and punishment is so common, and not even a single human being remembers. If the system of life cycle was through reincarnation, and the purpose of reincarnation was reward and punishment, then every individual should have remembered his previous life and the cause of reward or punishment in that life.

A quip: The answer to the first point in the Pandit's objection (i.e. God has the power to create souls all the time then what is the need to believe their pre-existence?) can be derived from his own belief, because if reincarnation is true, one will have to believe in the creation of souls beforehand. In addition, because of the first point (what is the need to believe souls' pre-existence?), the belief of eternity of souls, which was once attributed to the Pandit, has also been proven false, since if this belief is deemed valid, then the belief of eternity of souls has to be invalid.

Answer (2)

Answer to the first part of the objection: The essential element is soul which is comparable to a rider. The bodies of humans and all animals are like vehicle to the soul, and bodily organs are the tools for bodily actions. Movement, speech, hearing, and sighting etc. are executed through their respective organs, but the actual action is performed by the soul.

However, like a writer, despite the ability and expertise in writing, cannot write without a pen, the soul is also unable to perform any action without organs despite having the above-mentioned abilities. In other words, body's status as a vehicle and bodily organs' status as tools are very evident. How could it not be, when firstly the relation between the rider and the vehicle is that of upper and lower and secondly the rider is the master and the vehicle is obedient? As for being upper and lower, it is signified by the fact that soul is from heavenly world and body belongs to this subjacent world. Moreover, being master and obedient is indicated by the fact that soul is the controller and body is its subservient. Similarly, the relation between a tool and a performer is that of origin and medium,[23] as well as that of the controller and subservient. In short, the performer is the origin of action and the tool is the medium. So, the origin is the writer, then pen (which is the tool and medium), and then (end result are) letters and inscription.

Anyone with the slightest of logic will understand that the origin of voluntary actions is the soul and spiritual ability, then respective organs (arms and legs etc.), and then the required actions. Thus, just as in the indicated order, first is the presence of writer, then the need to make pen arises, and then the action of writing and inscriptions is performed, similarly, first there is a rider, then he gets horse or any other vehicle, after that comes riding and wandering. You may use the same analogy for other vehicles and tools. When such is the case, the soul which is the rider and

---

23 The starting point of something is called 'origin', the end point is called 'terminus', and the means to reach from start to the end is termed as 'medium'.

performer would also pre-exist and the body and organs would be created on a later stage.

Answer to the second part of the objection:[24] The answer to the second point is that the counting is required in wealth and other necessities. And because very few people's wealth reaches the figure of billion, this figure appears to us as big as the well appears to the frog living inside that well, which never saw beyond the well or heard more than that. That is why, if he is told about the vastness of ocean, he will not be able to comprehend. Although those who have been onboard a ship and have witnessed the greatness of ocean, will find it very small in front of other creations of God, such as the atmosphere or celestial sphere.

In a nutshell, this figure appears very big to those with less knowledge. This was the reason, perhaps, that they limited the number of souls in this figure without any evidence. That said, if you ask those who are well-informed of realities of this world, this figure does not stand anywhere in front of the magnificence of God and the quantity of his creations.

Discussion on the third part of the objection, the reincarnation: As a whole, the above figure and the reincarnation both are not proved by any evidence. The

24 That is, the objection that the total number of souls is 4.5 billion. It includes all souls; of humans and other species irrespective of their size, whether from land or sea. This number is not limited to humans only. Otherwise, there will be no explanation of reincarnation. According to this belief, human souls enter the bodies of insects and other small species as a punishment for their bad deeds done in the previous life. 4.5 billion is the aggregate number of souls. The learned author responds to this objection.

proof is of two types; textual and logical. Textual proof refers to evidences proved by word of God. If there is any word of God for Hindus, it is four Vedas, as they are perceived by them as the word of God.[25]

There is no proof of Vedas being the word of God and of their commandments being divine: But the situation is that Vedas neither mention that they are the word of God nor that Brahma, who is their first imparter, is the messenger of God. Even Brahma himself never claimed that he is God's messenger and Vedas are word of God. Unless these two things are proven, Vedas cannot be accepted as the divine word. Moreover, when we find therein teachings of worshiping things other than God, it makes our belief even stronger that surely these are not word of God, or they have been distorted beyond any doubt. That is to say, addition, deletion, modification, and alteration have taken place therein as a result of manipulation from corrupt people.[26]

---

25 Discussing textual proofs of reincarnation requires to elucidate whether the Vedas are the words of God or not, and if they are, whether they are protected from alteration or not, so that their status as an evidence can be validated.

26 The above-mentioned forms are of verbal distortion (*taḥrīf lafẓī*). However, there is a high possibility of semantical distortion (*taḥrīf ma'nawī*) as well. Rather, the Pandit himself has taken part in this form of distortion, as he has incorrectly translated many Sanskrit words from Vedas. See the book 'Toḥfa-e-Arya Samaj' (A gift for Arya Samaj), which was authored by a Sanskrit scholar who was earlier an important member of Arya Samaj. In this book, many incorrect translations of Pandit Dayanand have been pointed out in a chapter entitled 'Arya Samaj Ki Pol' (Exposing Arya Samaj), page 69. The topmost of those mistranslated words is the Sanskrit word 'Sarv Shaktiman' which actually translates to 'all-powerful', or 'absolutely-powerful', but the Pandit translated

The standard for the word of God is that it does not contradict the reality: It is because anything coming from God cannot contradict the reality. Clearly in this case, (since there are teachings to worship other than God,) it obligates to accept other than God as worthy to be worshipped.

One requirement of worship is to regard the one who is being worshipped as the absolute authority: To be worthy of being worshipped demands that He must be regarded as the sole master and the absolute authority. This cannot be imagined unless the authority of making existent and non-existent is surrendered to him, and his own existence must be self-standing, and he must have the power to grant this to whoever he wanted and refuse whoever he did not. But this thing is not true in respect of anyone except God. Therefore, the teachings of worshipping other than God lead to deem unworthy as worthy and to unnecessarily deny the fact.

Elaboration of a doubt and its answer:[27] However, like an instruction depends on the intention of the

---

it as 'the one who can do all his work without anyone's help'. Many other such mistranslations have been highlighted which the Pandit has committed against the rules of Sanskrit language. A reward of 3200 rupees has also been announced for anyone who could prove these translations as correct. The author of this book was formerly known as Babu Jagdamba parshad Varma who was an Aryan preacher, and after embracing Islam he was named Abdul Aziz. This book was published in 1906, and is available in the library of Darul Uloom.

27 In the following, the author clears a doubt that when God has the absolute authority, it also includes the authority to command people to worship some other thing. Then, how correct will it be not to regard a word as the word of God and a command as the

instructor, if knowledge was also dependent on the authority of the one with knowledge then it would have been fine. That said, everyone knows that in terms of causes, knowledge is unlike instruction, because in instruction the doer, i.e. the instructor, is followed, while in knowledge the object, i.e. the known, is followed. However the known is, willingly or unwillingly the knowledge complies with it.

In short, the teaching of worshipping other than God is not possible from God. Hence, Vedas are surely not divine or heavenly book, or they have been manipulated and, for this reason, they are not reliable. The conclusion of the above discussion is that the mentioned figure (of souls being 4.5 billion) and reincarnation are not proved by sacred texts.[28]

The theory of reincarnation is illogical: As far as logic is concerned, to prove the number (of souls being 4.5 billion) through logic is obviously unthinkable. As for proving reincarnation with the use of logic, the strongest argument one can give is that we see in this world that some people spend their entire lives with piousness, righteousness, and worshipping the God, yet their whole

---

divine command just because of finding one such command? The summary of the answer is that it is impossible that God leads His slaves to believe what is not the reality, and that he gives such a command which results in denying a correct and factual knowledge. This will be a clear lie which is impossible from God. And what leads to impossible is itself impossible. Hence, any such command from God is impossible.

28 Previously, It was said that proofs are of two types; textual and logical. First, the author discussed textual proof, and after finishing it, now he will refute the belief of reincarnation through logical arguments.

lives are full of sufferings. On the other hand, some people live their entire lives in vice, sins, and debauchery, but they live a luxurious and prosperous life. Now, when we compare these sufferings or luxuries with their current deeds, we find no compliance. We cannot say that these sufferings or luxuries are the rewards or punishments of their deeds in the present life. Neither can we say that these are rewards or punishments for their deeds in future, since neither reward can be given before good deeds nor punishment before committing a crime.[29] Therefore, we will have to say that they must have done good or bad deeds in the past and these sufferings or comforts are the rewards or punishments for those deeds. But this cannot be understood without assuming that they must have come to this world before this life, and this is the reincarnation.

First answer: But if you look closely, this argument is as fragile as spider's web. Who does not know that suffering and luxury are not always the result of reward and punishment? If someone gives comfort to another person out of courtesy, that is not considered a reward. Similarly, when a surgeon operates a wound, or a doctor gives bitter medicine to a patient, or a child's parents displease him by sending him to school, all these are not considered punishments of any crime. This type of comforts and sufferings are present in the world more often than the ones given as a reward or punishment.

29 We raise this objection against Christians' belief of atonement too that Prophet Isa (peace be upon him) was tormented three days in hell to pay the price for the sins of all humankind, though those millions and billions of humans were not even born at that time for whose future sins he was made to suffer, and he was tormented before occurrence of the sins.

Confining the comfort and suffering into reward and punishment is an insult to God: Unfortunately, Hindus have limited the comfort and suffering into reward and punishment, and what they did not realize is that if this limitation is from God, then humans will become better than God. There (among humans) is still some generosity, but here (in the court of God,) there is no generosity. There (among humans) was some cure and kindness, but here is none of these. Then, the same God is named merciful, generous, healer, provider of needs, and sustainer of the world.

If offerings by generous people are out of generosity, the pain given by a surgeon or a doctor is for cure, and parents' strictness on sending their children to school is to educate them, then such offerings from God are (even more) inevitable so that these qualities can be associated to him as well. Otherwise, the creation will become better than the creator.

Another evidence for voidness of reincarnation: In addition to the above, the voidness of reincarnation is also evident by the fact that the reward or punishment requires prior knowledge, especially as per the belief of Hindus. It is because, according to them, reward and punishment are not intended themselves, rather they have been enforced so that people, out of desire or fear, avoid bad deeds and achieve salvation. Undeniably, this objective cannot be realized unless the one who is getting the reward or punishment knows the deeds and circumstances that led to this situation.

Like Muslims, however, if the reward and punishment were considered similar to the price of a sold

item or the wage of an employee,[30] no prior information would have been required, as in that case, that thing (i.e. the price or wage) is itself desired. Whatever, happiness or sadness, comes about is caused by it. Whichever way it comes (it causes happiness,) and whichever way it goes, (it causes sadness) the way of obtaining it (that how it came and how it went) is never given any importance, and therefore, not recalling it does not cause any harm. Nevertheless, if that way is not remembered,[31] it may put stakeholders into predicament, but this makes remembering an impression of an external requirement. This remembrance is not required for the sake of reward and punishment (i.e. it does not affect the status of reward and punishment as being intended themselves).

To come to the point, in the view of Muslims the story ends at the heaven or hell, since for them the comfort and suffering (of the heaven and hell) to the deeds are like price to the sold item or sold item to the price, or like services of employee to his wage or wage to his services, meaning that the story ends at the heaven or hell just like it ends at these things, and nothing else is intended through them. These things are intended on their own, unlike Hindus who claim that the reward and punishment are meant for other purpose. For them, (the reward or

30 The purpose and desired outcome of a trade deal is to obtain the price of the sold item, and in a hiring contract, it is to obtain the wage. Upon fulfillment of this purpose, the contract between the buyer and seller and the employer and employee comes to an end. It is not that the price or wage is a source or means to acquire something else, or that they are not intended on their own.

31 For example, the payment of the price was associated to a specific place or specific time, or the wage was conditioned with the employer’s satisfaction and services were specified.

punishment that they get in this world) are for salvation like raw ingredients for bread. The matter, however, is different for Muslims, since for them the reward or punishment is desired or hated just like the presence or absence of bread is desired or hated. If the bread is not intended itself, rather it is also meant for some other purpose similar to raw ingredients, then you may pick up anything that is intended itself as the example, and then you may compare it with reward and punishment from Muslims' perspective.

To conclude, prior knowledge is not required for the reward and punishment in the Muslims' viewpoint. As for Hindus, this is unnecessarily made a requirement, because when it is meant for some other purpose, the knowledge of that purpose is imperative. The raw ingredients are only useful when it is also known what they can be used for. Similarly, the reward and punishment will work only when the subject is aware of his deed which resulted in this punishment and deprivation of salvation, and he knows that if he repeats the same deed, he will remain deprived.

Not remembering the covenant of "Am I not your Lord?" cannot be presented as counter argument: You cannot present the covenant of "Am I not your Lord?" to counter arguments of Muslims,[32] because that covenant

---

32 The covenant of 'am I not your Lord?' indicates the event mentioned in the Holy Quran in the following verse:

وَإِذْ أَخَذَ رَبُّكَ مِنْ بَنِي آدَمَ مِنْ ظُهُورِهِمْ ذُرِّيَّتَهُمْ وَ أَشْهَدَهُمْ على أَنْفُسِهِمْ أَلَسْتُ بِرَبِّكُمْ قالُوا بَلى شَهِدْنا أَنْ تَقُولُوا يَوْمَ الْقِيامَةِ إِنَّا كُنَّا عَنْ هذا غافِلِين. اَوْ تَقُوْلُوْٓا اِنَّمَآ اَشْرَكَ اٰبَآؤُنَا مِنْ قَبْلُ وَكُنَّا ذُرِّيَّةً مِّنْ بَعْدِهِمْ اَفَتُهْلِكُنَا بِمَا فَعَلَ الْمُبْطِلُوْنَ.

Translation: And [mention] when your Lord took from the children of Adam - from their loins - their descendants and made them testify of themselves, [saying to them], "Am I not your

was meant to educate, and since knowledge is intended in education, only knowledge is needed to remain in the heart. Remembrance of all circumstances of education, the environment, and time of education is not mandatory. We start learning a language from childhood, but after we have learned, only words and their meanings stay in mind. When did we learn, who was the teacher, what were the circumstances, what prompted to learn, and what was the event, all these things are not usually borne in mind. Even those who learn after reaching the age of consciousness, do not often recall the time and place of learning a particular thing. In short, the purpose of teaching and learning is knowledge, its preservation and maintenance is important, rather than the circumstances.

The outcome of the covenant of "Am I not your Lord?" was that God made his slaves acknowledge the Deity and Lordship of Himself. It does not imply other than that God's Lordship should be kept in mind so that the slaves continue to fulfill His rights, and they do not worship other than him, and apparently this is just a knowledge that needs to be preserved. The information of its circumstances and the situation at the time of this event, if forgotten, do not cause any harm. Thus, this has been embodied in everyone's heart that God is our creator and our master.

Lord?" They said, "Yes, we have testified." [This] - lest you should say on the day of Resurrection, "Indeed, we were of this unaware." Or [lest] you say, "It was only that our fathers associated [others in worship] with Allah before, and we were but descendants after them. Then would You destroy us for what the falsifiers have done?" [Al-A'raf, 7:172-173].

Since this verse mentions the words "Am I not your Lord?", this event is known as "the covenant of Am I not your Lord?".

The covenant of “Am I not your Lord?” is not against logic: The conclusion is that it is imperative for reward and punishment to remember the deeds for which the reward and punishment is being enforced. As for teaching and learning, recalling the time and event related to the teaching and learning is not important. When this is the case, the occurrence of the above covenant is not against logic; rather not taking place would have been illogical, since without education, there is no way to fulfill the rights of God, and that education is called the covenant. Moreover, the enforcement of the reward and punishment in the form of reincarnation is against the reason. But non-enforcement is not against the reason rather it complies with logic.

Why non-enforcement of reward and punishment in the form of reincarnation complies with logic? The first reason of compliance is that this world has been created for the purpose of worship, as testified by every sane mind. Just as kitchen and garment factory are established for the purpose of food and garments, so is this factory (i.e. this world) for the purpose of worship. Like in there, the main purpose is food and garments and everything else is a medium to acquire this purpose. The chef is the doer and all other things are like tools and raw materials for him. Similarly, in this world, the main purpose is worship and everything else is a means to acquire this purpose. Humans are the worshippers, the doers, and whatever else there is, is comparable to instruments for the worship.

To elaborate, the land, water, air, fire, sun, moon, stars, inanimate objects, flora, fauna, and everything in

between the earth and the sky is for human being. Human being is not for anything else. If the above-mentioned things were not there, life would have been impossible, and even if it was possible, it must have been very difficult. On the contrary, if humans are not there, it will not make any difference to these things. To sum up, everything here is either essential for life or is a need of the body, some are dietary and others are remedies.

Logical evidence to the claim that everything in the world is for human being, and humans are to worship God: If humans were the creator, then the job of creations would have been to serve them. (But it is apparent and agreed upon that humans are not the creator rather they are creation, so) in spite of being creation, if they are not useful for others, their existence will be mere useless, and they will be the worst creation. On the other hand, if they are useful, their usefulness is not for other creations, as it has been mentioned earlier that their absence does not affect other creations.[33] Apparently, the job of other (creations) is to remove any kind of hardship (from humans so that nothing could prevent them from worshipping God). Therefore, humans must be for the service of God. However, being serviceable to God does not mean that God needs them for something and they can satisfy that need of God. Or else, what will be the difference between Deity and worshippers? What this service may refer to is that God's

33 Humans have no role to play in the existence and survival of other creations. Humans' absence does not affect their living and function. Land, sky, sun, moon, stars, air, water etc. have been in existence for thousands of years before humans' arrival, and they have been functioning without any problem.

independence, greatness, glory, and power is manifested in their humility and submission, and this is what meant by worship.

Demonstrating God's glory and one's devotion, humility, and submission by any word or action is worship: Actual worship is this devotion and submission. Rest is just a way to accomplish it. At this point, one will have to agree that humans have been created for devotion, and this devotion, humility, and submission is what is required of him. Afterall, one requires something which he does not already have, and what is that which God does not have except this humility, submission, disgrace, and degradation, which are epitomized in devotion? Thus, the scenario is that human being is for God and the whole universe is for human being. This is similar to saying that horse is for the rider to ride, and grass is for the horse. But as rational people see that the grass is also for the rider to fulfill the purpose of riding, equally, this whole universe is also for worship.

To summarize, the purpose of all these things which satisfy the needs of human being is that humans should be able to fulfill their needs and worship the God with carefree mind. Otherwise, just as the horse cannot be ridden if he did not get grass, so would humans, in the absence of the above-mentioned things, not be able to observe the rights of devotion.

In conclusion, the real purpose of this universe is the act of worship. Human being is the performer of this act and everything else is a mere instrument or aid for this worship. The task is one but instruments are many, and the situation is comparable to the case where many people

come together to lift a heavy stone. As in this case, the helping hands are many but the task is one. Likewise here, the tools are many but the job is single; to worship.

Actual job is nothing other than worship: Now, when the job has been established as one, it is not possible to count it in two things; worship and the reward and punishment. If reincarnation is true, as Hindus believe, one task will have to be counted in both regards. It will be similar to the case that, suppose in a sale contract, one thing belongs to the seller and the same is owned by the buyer, or in an employment deal, one thing belongs to the employer and the employee both.[34] As this fusion (*tadākhul*) is impossible, the fusion between worship and the reward and punishment, by counting one single thing for both worship and the reward and punishment, is also not possible.

Summary of the above explanation: The above explanation makes it clear that just as manure fuel and firewood are counted in food, which is why the price of manure fuel and firewood etc. is calculated with food and it is said that the food costed this much. Equally, everything in the world, every situation, every hardship, and every comfort account for the act of worship. Now, if reincarnation is also true then everything, every situation, every hardship, and every comfort will account for the reward and punishment too. Even if everything does not account for the reward and punishment, in the case of

34 Every action is connected to the viewpoint of the doer. That is why there cannot be two contradictory viewpoints for the same task. Believing in the facet of the reward and punishment and that of the worship and devotion are two contradictory viewpoints.

reincarnation, some of the things will definitely do. But everything has to be included necessarily in the account of worship. Briefly, the fusion will definitely occur either in everything or in some of the things.

Third evidence for voidness of reincarnation:[35] Second reason for reincarnation's irrationality is that from childhood to the last breath of life, different states (*kaifiyāt*) consecutively come upon a person through 'qualitative motion' (*ḥarkat-e-kaifī*).[36] From childhood through youth to old age, just like change in the physical states, different states come upon the soul as well. So, just as in the physical change, that first it was childhood then gradually came youth and then old age, certain states come upon successively through 'ascending motion' (*ḥarkat-e-ṣā'idah*),[37] similarly spiritual states, which come upon the soul in correspondence to the aforesaid physical change, should also be perceived ascending from start to the end.

---

35 Previously, the author described why the enforcement of the reward and punishment not as reincarnation complies with logic. One of the reasons for this has been expounded and then put briefly. This is the second reason which is third in the tally of evidences.

36 All the beings go through three kinds of motions; temporal motion (*ḥarkat-e-zamānī*), spatial motion (*harkat-e-makānī*), and qualitative motion (*harkat-e-kaifī*). 'Temporal motion' refers to consecutive occurrence of quantum time of the future, or the continuous progress of all events towards future which is never stopping. 'Spatial motion' is the kind of motion that occurs by moving from one space to another or by spin of particles of a mass around its centre. 'Qualitative motion' means to move from one state to another.

37 'Ascending motion' (*harkat-e- ṣā'idah*) refers to the motion of an object, such as stone, that is thrown in the upward direction. After completion of this motion, when the stone begins to come down, that motion is called 'descending motion' (*harkat-e-hābiṭah*).

After ascending motion, the object must cover the same distance in the descending motion: For this reason, coming back to the previous state is as unimaginable as coming back of the ascending object without descending motion. What it conveys is that if you throw a stone in the upward direction then after completing the ascending motion, the stone cannot come back without moving downward. It is impossible that, after completing the ascending motion, the stone comes back to the ground without descending motion (which brings things down).

In other words, it is compulsory to cover the previously covered distance. The only difference will be that starting point of the first motion (from where the motion began) will (now) become the end point (i.e. the motion will now end on that), and the end point of the first motion (at which the ascending motion ended) will now become starting point of the motion. The segment which was covered early in the first motion will be covered later in the second motion.[38] All in all, there will be either change in the motion's direction or the direction will be reversed, but the distance will remain the same. It is not possible that the distance does not come in the way, and the object comes from the end point to the starting point without any movement.[39]

---

38 It is when the first motion took the object to many levels. If it was limited to only one level then, in the descending motion, its front part will become rear and vice versa. Or there might be inversion of the motion and the stone might fall in a different direction.

39 The example of throwing stone in the upward direction is of spatial motion. It has been presented to make the argument easier to understand. An analogy may be drawn between this and the qualitative motion. Further, the author elucidates his objective from this argument by demonstrating resemblance between the

But when we look into the reincarnation, we do not find it complying with the aforesaid statement. (Reincarnation implies that) after completing the indicated motion, without another motion and without covering the distance, (a state) goes from end point to starting point. What it means is that after all the spiritual developments that continue to take place from childhood till the end of life, and after all accomplishments in terms of knowledge and practice which were achieved gradually over a long span of time, return of the initial state and vanishing of all accomplishments with a mere death is as absurd as coming down of an object after completing ascending motion without descending motion. The only difference is that the motion of the stone was spatial, whereas that of the soul is qualitative. But the ascending there is similar to the development here, and descending there is comparable to decline here. Hence, the two comparable motions and change of direction are found here as well. Though the movement there was from one space to another, here it is from one quality to another.

A doubt and its clarification: If someone raises a doubt that knowledge, habits, and character are accidents (*'awāriḍ*), and it is possible for accidents to vanish all of a sudden; a lamp's light disappears as soon as it blows out. The answer is that not all accidents are alike. (For example,) although surface is an accident (*āriḍ*) for body, the body can never be without surface. Similarly, space, i.e. the mere dimension or its imaginary surface which

starting point, end point, and distance of the spatial motion and those of the qualitative motion.

surrounds a body like air or water surrounds it or like a mould wraps around the article which is being moulded,[40] is also an accident for the body, yet a body can never be imagined without its space. Therefore, just as the body cannot be separated from the above-mentioned things, despite them being accidents, so is the soul that it cannot be separated from the qualities, knowledge, and character. As the body requires a random surface and space, the soul also requires any kind of knowledge, quality, and character.

The case of quality and character is evident for all those with rationality, since characters, be it good or bad, are associated with the soul from the inception. This is the reason why, from the beginning, some people are forbearing and others are intolerant, some are generous and others are miser, similarly some are intelligent and others are dull.

As for the knowledge, its necessity is signified by the fact that learning ability is attached with the soul from the beginning just as light and rays are with the sun. All the beings have surrounded the soul as the earth and celestial bodies have surrounded the sun. Considering these facts, it is inevitable for one of the bodies to gleam in the sunlight. In the same way, in the presence of the above (mentioned learning ability), knowledge of something by the soul is equally inevitable.[41]

40 In philosophy, space is a term for the dimension (area) in which a body is present. So, our space is the area of atmosphere in which our body exists.

41 Just like those bodies which are surrounded by sunlight are overtaken by that light, the images which are before the soul are apprehended by the soul. The apprehension of those images is called knowledge, since knowledge is defined as perception of the image of a thing in the mind.

And the loss of senses in the state of unconsciousness does not indicate the absence of knowledge.[42] Rather, due to mind's absorption in pain, the knowledge of knowledge (*'ilm al-'ilm*) is absent.[43] If the knowledge (of knowledge) was not absent, it would not have been unconsciousness. The cause of unconsciousness is extreme pain or fatigue that leads to fall asleep. So, the fatigue is also a kind of pain. Pain is nothing other than an unpleasant physical sensation. When mind gets immersed in that sensation, it is called unconsciousness. Thus, due to this immersion, other things are neglected (even though they are present). Even sense itself is disregarded, and hence sense is not sensed, or in other words, knowledge is not known. Apparently, complete immersion is also a sensation, and it is a knowledge too.[44] In conclusion, unconsciousness is

42 **Clarification of a doubt:** A doubt pops up here that the soul does not necessarily have the knowledge of things surrounding it. We see that in the state of unconsciousness, we do not perceive things which are before our eyes, and we do not apprehend their knowledge. Likewise, it is possible that despite being surrounded by things, the soul does not apprehend their knowledge. Thus, your claim that the knowledge of something by the soul is inevitable is proven wrong. In reply to this anticipated objection, the author asserts this.

43 When a figure comes before a mirror, its reflection necessarily appears in the mirror. Similarly, anything that comes before eyes, its image certainly reaches the mind through eyes. That image is termed as 'known' (*ma'lūm*), and this is what knowledge refers to. After perception of the image in mind, the knowledge cannot be denied. What happens (in unconsciousness) is that the mind is immersed in pain and does not pay attention to the perception of image. This inattention is what the author has expressed through 'absence of knowledge of knowledge'.

44 Complete perception of any naturally unpleasant state is also a knowledge, and such deep involvement in that which diverts attention from everything else, which is called immersion, is also a sense. In fact, unconsciousness is a secret physical protection system. The diversion of cognition from naturally unpleasant

always accompanied by knowledge, but it appears as the absence of knowledge because the knowledge of knowledge is missing (i.e. it is not unconsciousness in the sense of absence of consciousness or cognition).

To come to the point, knowledge, state, and character are necessary for the soul as surface and space are necessary for the body. Therefore, just like coming back to the starting point after spatial ascending motion is not possible without spatial descending motion,[45] similarly after all the spiritual developments, i.e. the development with respect to knowledge, quality (state), and character which were achieved gradually through qualitative ascending motion (the progress from low level of knowledge, state, and character to high levels), returning to the initial state is impossible without descending motion. Moreover, unless the distance in between is retraversed, coming back to the first state is unimaginable.

The summary:[46] The summary of the discussion is that, firstly, there is no evidence to prove reincarnation, and even if we suppose its possibility as Hindus claim, it cannot be held as a belief unless evidence is provided. But neither there is

---

thing (such as the pain of surgery) and complete immersion in some other thing, or you can say the change of the subject of consciousness, is called unconsciousness.

45 It means that when something moves upward, which is called ascending motion, then after termination of the movement, coming down to the same point from where it started moving upward, which is called starting point, without spatial descending motion is impossible. It is unimaginable that it reaches the highest point and then comes back to the starting point without any movement.

46 Since the discussion got lengthy and in a lengthy discussion main points are often engulfed and consequently they become hard to grasp, the author has summarized the subject matter in the following to make it easily comprehensible.

any textual evidence nor logical. Then, a little consideration revealed that, regardless of validity of evidence, even according to Hindus' belief it seems to be fallacious. The reason is that if reincarnation is for the purpose of reward and punishment, the people who are going through the reward or punishment must remember the deeds that lead to this reward or punishment. Thus, even if reincarnation is supposed to be possible, it is certainly erroneous due to the absence of indicated remembrance. Moving on, further deliberation unveiled that reincarnation contradicts logic and practicability. Firstly, because it will lead to count one thing for both worship and the reward and punishment, and it is apparent that such fusion is as though one thing, in a sale contract, is owned by the seller and belongs to the buyer as well; both are impossible to the same extent. Secondly, it implies coming back after spiritual development without traversing the previously covered distance. Evidently, this is same as the case wherein suppose a stone goes upward and comes back without moving downward and without covering the distance.

In short, there are four objections against those who believe in reincarnation; First, because of the absence of evidence, second, because of fallaciousness, third, because of invalidity of fusion (*tadākhul*), and fourth, because of impossibility of returning without movement.

As for the arguments for proving the Judgement Day, they are also among the reasons to disprove reincarnation.[47] Since one of the objections raised by the Pandit is related to the

47 It is because the belief of reincarnation is based on the reward and punishment, once it is proved that the reward and punishment are confined to the Day of Judgement, the belief of reincarnation will automatically be refuted. Hence, all the arguments that substantiate Judgement Day will also disapprove reincarnation.

belief in the Day of Judgement, I will present those arguments, by the will of Allah, in my response to that objection. The believers of reincarnation must go through them.

Objection no. 5

Muslims claim that whoever offers food to a fasting person to break his fast will get seventy fair women (*ḥūr al-ʻayn*) in paradise as a reward. So, a woman who offers food to a fasting person deserves to get seventy men as a reward.

Answer (1)

Getting seventy fair women as the reward of offering food to a fasting person is neither mentioned in any book of Muslims, nor did we ever hear. But it is true that men will get multiple women in paradise according to their ranks, and women will not get more than one husband therein. This is same as in this world, as per the ruling of Islam, several women are permissible for a man but several men are not permissible for a woman. The reward in paradise will be in the same way. So, if this is objectionable, there cannot be any other motive behind this objection than that men and women should have been treated equally. Why was this difference allowed?

The only reason for equality is that, rationally, rules must be equal for men and women in everything. In other words, whatever reward men are getting for a good deed, the same reward should be given to women, since the reward is a remuneration for work and when a rate has been determined for men, the same rate should be offered to

women. What sin have they committed which caused deduction in their right?

If the motive of objection is equality in rights then the Pandit must allow women, drawing an analogy on polygamy of Shri Krishna and others, to have multiple husbands. When both are equal in rules then what sin have women committed that they do not have permission to have more than one husband, while men are allowed to have several wives?

If the motive is that payment for service and remuneration for work should be equal regardless of who the worker or service provider is, be it a man or woman, the difference in payment based on difference of gender is not fair. The answer to this is that the permission in this world has been granted to satisfy the need. If difference in payment or reward is against fairness and justice, caring so much for satisfying one's needs and showing thriftiness to another is against generosity and nobility. If fairness and justice are among attributes of God then generosity, nobility, mercy, and tenderness are His attributes too. But what kind of nobility and tenderness will it be if one is given utmost care and another faces unconcern and apathy. If one was not aware of another's situation then, due to unawareness, this attitude would not be disheartening and as such it would not raise a question on nobility, generosity, and mercy. However, considering that He is well aware of everything, this open discrimination is not suitable for the glory of God.

The Pandit, supposedly, may not have any problem with the decree (that a woman may have multiple husbands), because Vyasa gave Draupadi to five brothers, the king Yudhishthira, Bhimasena, Arjuna, Nakula, and

Sahadeva, and Krishna did not express any objection to it. But on the one hand, all religions including Hinduism itself, according to its Dharma Shastras (treatises of Hinduism), are against this practice, and on the other all learned, intellectual, and wise men dislike it. If the reason of dislike is unknown to you then you need to listen.

Why polygyny is allowed and polyandry is forbidden? Woman for offspring is like land for crops. But the crops can be equally divided due to similarity in its grains, that is why there is no harm in sharing that. However, if a woman is shared among several men then by marital right each of them will have the right to satisfy his desire at every given moment. In this case, there is possibility of discord and animosity among them if they all want to satisfy their desires at the same time. Moreover, if after marriage, by the indicated right, all of them continued to fulfill their needs, then in the event of a child's birth, the child cannot be divided so that everyone could take his portion, and if many children are born, then due to the differences of gender, appearance and facial features, habits and character, and capability and competency the children cannot be compared with each other so that everyone could take one and soothe his heart. Furthermore, since love is equal for all children, another problem is that one will not be as much happy by getting one child as he will be sad by separation from others. As such, only God knows what chaos will be created. In short, this system would have caused corruption of the world order.

On the contrary, if man is single and women are many then just as one farmer can cultivate many lands, one man can also impregnate many women. In addition, there is

no possibility of harm; displeasure of women does not cause any fear of bloodshed.

To conclude, one woman's marriage with five Pandavas is not a way to satisfaction, rather this story raises objections against the Pandit and senior clergy of his religion.

Answer (2)

In reward, only means of comfort and mediums of honor are bestowed, not the means of sorrow and mediums of humiliation. The latter is for punishment. Once this is borne in mind, now listen! Everything in paradise will be as reward and recompense. If a man gets several women over there, this will be an honor and a means of comfort. But if a woman gets several husbands, it will not be a reason of much comfort, especially when a man's power will be increased to be enough to satisfy all of his women, as Islamic narratives testify this. Since, in this case, it will not cause any extra comfort rather, instead of honor, it will be the reason of humiliation and degradation.

To elaborate, woman, as per Islamic principles, is dominated (*maḥkūm*) and man is dominant (*ḥākim*). The reason is that man is the owner, and that is why he is even called owner. Just as slave girls are owned, so are wives purchased by husband through dower (*mahr*). If there he has the right to liberate, here he possesses the right to divorce. Just as slave girls and boys cannot set themselves free, a wife cannot get freed from her husband by her own will but the husband has the option to divorce her if he wishes. As the expenses of slaves are borne by the owner, so the husband is responsible to pay maintenance to his

wife. Like the owner is usually one and slaves can be many, so the husband is one and wives can be many.

Clarification of a doubt:[48] As a whole, wives, as per Islamic principles, are owned and dominated and husband is the owner and dominant. Not having the right to sell or gift by the husband is not a proof of non-ownership. Had this been a proof of non-ownership, even the ownership of God could not have been established. Rather not being transferred by sale or gift, after establishment of the ownership (which has been discussed above), indicates the firmness of the ownership just like not transferring the ownership of God indicates the firmness of His ownership. For this reason, the husband has total resemblance with God in terms of ownership, although husband's ownership is very insignificant compared to that of God. Besides, God's ownership is impossible to detach from Him, while husband's ownership is possible to detach by divorce. Yet, nobody's ownership resembles the ownership of God as much as that of the husband does.

In summary, the ownership of the husband is indisputable, rather his ownership is stronger than that of others; he is the ruler and the wife is subordinate. Apparently, abundance of subordinates and their multitude is a cause of honor. The king who has more number of subjects is considered more honorable, whereas the

---

48 A doubt can be raised on husband's ownership over his wife that if husband is the owner of the wife, why can he not sell her? The owner of slaves, cows, and buffaloes has the right to sell them, similarly the husband should have the right to sell her wife or give her as a gift, but he does not have this right, hence proving that the claim of his ownership over wife is not correct. The author has responded to this.

abundance of rulers causes humiliation. Even the system of this world is that rulers are not many (one person is not directly ruled by many rulers), rather he is ruled by a sequence of rulers from top to bottom (directly or indirectly), by all or most or some of them. Look at the common citizen, they are ruled by all and do not rule anyone; no one is inferior to them. Junior officials are governed by their seniors and at the same time they govern common citizen; they are superior to common citizen but inferior to senior officials, and the same goes on to the top. The king is the ruler of all and he is not ruled by anybody; no one is above him.

Taking that into account, if a woman has many husbands, it will be as though one single person is the subject, and kings and rulers are many. Everyone knows that it is not practical. One queen Victoria has millions of subjects, but every individual citizen does not have millions of queens. In brief, there cannot be many rulers of the same rank. Furthermore, if husbands are many then it will be as if she has many rulers, and the more rulers one will have the more inferiority will be in him. Therefore, if such inferiority and humiliation of women was allowed, it could have happened in some religion of this world, but in the paradise, which is the place of honor and comfort, such humiliation is not possible.

Admittedly, if one husband had not been able to satisfy her desire or give her enough pleasure, this thing could be proposed then out of compulsion. However, authentic Islamic traditions certify that every man in paradise will get so much strength that he will be able to go to thirty women consecutively. Overall, only one husband

is required to satisfy her desire. More than that is unnecessary rather humiliating for the women of paradise, whereas the paradise is, evidently, a place of honor and respect not that of humiliation and insult.

The above discussion has elucidated that this objection does not befall the principles of Islam. If it befalls the principles of other religions, especially the principles of Hindus, that is not beyond the bounds of possibility. The reason is that they neither have dower which denotes purchase[49] nor do they have divorce so that the possibility of termination of ownership could form a basis to prove the ownership of husband.[50] When there is no ownership,

---

49 In this religion, unlike other religions of the world, man does not pursue woman so that woman could demand a compensation for giving man the proprietary right over herself, which is termed in Islam as *mahr*. Instead, woman makes the first move for marriage and the proposal is sent to man; man is sought after. Therefore, the compensation for woman's service remains out of question.

50 While owner has a right to take custody and use his owned entity, he also has the right to terminate his custody and his right to use. This termination is known in Islamic terminology as *ṭalāq* (divorce) which literally means to set free. It should be noted that man's proprietary right has a restriction that he cannot give his wife to someone else's custody or use, like he has the right to allow someone to benefit from his goat or cow while retaining his ownership. Yet, this restriction will not affect his ownership. For, this restriction has been imposed from outside i.e. it has been imposed from Allah who is the actual owner. A clear example of this in our time is the issue of cow that in India cow can be owned by anybody but its slaughter has been banned by the sovereign government. This ban does not suggest that cow is not in the ownership. Since this ban has been imposed from outside, it does not affect the ownership per se.

It is worth noting that religiously Hindus do not have any concept of divorce, as it has been mentioned here. But during the reign of current government, divorce has been incorporated in Hindu Code Bill. Now, the relationship of husband and wife is no more indissoluble like it used to be in the past.

husband and wife will have equal rights and will hold equal status, and one will not be the owner of another like the case of buyer and seller and employee and employer. Therefore, if men are allowed polygamy, as the above discussed rational argument certifies and abundance of queens of Shri Krishna is strong textual evidence against Hindus, women should also be allowed polyandry as per their principles. Further, the marriage of Draupadi with five brothers (Yudhishthira, Bhima, Arjuna, Nakula, and Sahadeva) at the same time, with a decree from the founder of Hindu religion and compiler of Vedas, Vyasa, in the presence of Shri Krishna and with his certification, and Urvashi's coupling with everyone in paradise, as it has been mentioned in Mahabharata, are a sound evidence for permissibility of polyandry in this world as well as a good instance of abundance of men for women in the paradise.

In this case, it is surprising how the Pandit had the audacity to raise this objection against Muslims. Either he does not regard these books as credible in which the story of Draupadi's marriage with five brothers and the coupling of Urvashi has been recorded, or his (objection's) motive is that why Muslims' religion does not have such fundamentals as our religion does?

If the motive of objection is the first reason (i.e. not regarding those books as credible), the answer is that the book which is considered authentic by all Hindu scholars cannot be declared unauthentic merely by your claim. Authenticity and unauthenticity of religious scriptures depend on soundness and weakness, reliability and unreliability of narration. Evidently, this is a matter of transmission; reason plays no role in it. Hence, everyone is obliged to adhere to his

preceding researchers. Or it depends on compliance or non-compliance of the content of the scripture with commonly accepted beliefs (*musallamāt*) of the people of that religion. In this case, who is above Shri Krishna and Vyasa in Hindu religion? Vyasa issued the decree, and Shri Krishna let it happen and did not prohibit.

If the motive of objection is the second reason (that Islamic beliefs are not in harmony with Hinduism), its answer has been given earlier which illuminated that the beliefs of Muslims are correct and the beliefs of Hindus are wrong.

Objection no. 6

Muslims claim that repentance erases sins. This is incorrect; reward or punishment for every deed is granted through reincarnation. Punishment cannot be pardoned, as it is against justice.

Answer (1)

The Pandit might not regard other books, but about the four Vedas he has acknowledged in his written response to our letter that even a single word of Vedas is not incorrect.

Evidences of forgiveness from authentic books of Hinduism: It is mentioned in Atharva Veda that chanting Taraka erases sins of births. If justice demanded punishment, what is the reason of this forgiveness (of sins of births) without punishment? If it was due to the remembrance of God, disregarding the fact that this forgiveness is against justice according to the Pandit,

repentance is also a form of God’s remembrance. Obviously, forgiveness upon God’s remembrance in remorseful manner is more reasonable than upon any other kind of remembrance.[51] Apart from this, here is another certification of forgiveness upon repentance itself. Mahabharata is an authentic book and it mentions: “If someone feels remorse after committing a sin and recompenses it before long, he will attain deliverance.” Please enlighten us if feeling remorse is not repentance then what is it? Repentance is nothing but remorse. Besides,[52] the equality between things which belong to the same category can be measured through scale or weighing machine etc., but equality between things from different categories cannot be measured except through similarity in price and value. Thus, if Allah’s right and repentance are from different categories, Allah’s right and remembrance of Taraka (who was mentioned above with reference to Atharva Veda) are also not from the same category. If the comparison between Allah’s right and remembrance of Taraka is in terms of value, how did the Pandit find out that

---

51 The argument above is based on the common ground between chanting Taraka and repentance (i.e. remembrance of God) so as the result whose occurrence by the remembrance of God is accepted there, the same result is ought to be recognized here too. Further, the author provides explicit evidence on forgiveness upon repentance from Mahabharata. If the Pandit does not believe in this book, it is up to him, but the vast majority of Hindus believe in its authenticity. The author asserts...

52 Following is the clarification of a doubt that in committing a sin, the right of Allah is overlooked which is a punishable ‘act’, while repentance is just a ‘word’. Action and word are not from the same category that one could recompense another. Therefore, a word cannot recompense an action. That is why repentance cannot compensate the sinful act.

repentance is not equal to Allah's right in terms of value? Moreover, if God has willingly accepted the remembrance of Taraka, without considering its value, as compensation for His right, what stops the same here?

Answer (2)

Not paying off others' right or, despite being a ruler, not getting the rightful person obtained his right is undoubtedly injustice. But forgoing one's own right cannot be called injustice except by the Pandit. By raising this objection, the Pandit (actually) suggests that giving up one's own right is also injustice. What it means is that we and the Pandit agree on the point that when someone commits a sin, he does injustice to God and therefore, as per the rule of justice, he deserves punishment. Further, we say that initially God's right was that the slave should not have committed the sin, and now after committing the sin, God has the right to punish him, and he is required to accept this by his heart. Suppose if he had the power to escape from God's hands and save himself from the punishment, or he complains about the punishment and calls it injustice, then just like he was wrongdoer because of doing injustice to God, now this would be another injustice and wrongdoing. However, this wrongdoing is similar to the supposed case that some common citizen scams the government and free-spends all the money. No doubt, this scam is injustice but, generally, the government is not called oppressed (*maẓlūm*). Likewise, in the customary sense, God cannot be called oppressed, although in literal sense it is possible to call him that.

Principally, we say that God's right is upon his slaves. Moreover, doing justice is the liability of the one upon whom the right is due, not the one who is entitled to

that right. The one who is entitled is not obliged to obtain his right willingly or unwillingly, and if the one who is liable refuses to hand over his right then he is not obliged to punish him. Therefore, God has power to choose to either forgo his right, or forgive it after repentance and remorse, or set the sinner free on someone else's recommendation.

As a matter of fact, the just God does not, outwardly, forsake the rights of others. He only forsakes if those who are entitled forgo their rights themselves. Even though, fundamentally, He has this power of choice in the rights of His servants (*ḥuqūq al-'ibād*) too. Because he is the owner of all creations per se, he will be the owner of the rights of servants in the first place.

Furthermore, the Pandit says that God does not have the option to forgive even in his own rights, and the justice requires Him to reward the obedient and punish the wrongdoer mandatorily. But the fair-minded and unbiased readers should decide themselves who is righteous. The one who is entitled cannot be insisted on obtaining his right, rather such insistence will account for injustice.

The common sense, on the contrary, suggests that justice does not even require God to reward the obedient. Since, the whole universe is His property and His slave, and the slave does not entitle for any remuneration for his service. Though, you may consider the reward as mandatory by virtue of His generosity and tenderness.

However,[53] just as right is taken into account in justice, so is merit considered in generosity and tenderness.

53 This is to clarify a doubt that when reward is certain owing to His generosity and tenderness, why there is difference between a believer and disbeliever? Everyone should be treated equally. In the response, the author says…

Thus, this generosity is based on a merit. This is a standard which is never compromised. That merit is what makes the creation worthy of His generosity.[54] This is same as our saying “charity is the right of poor”. Apparently, their right is not similar to the rights that incur in a sale or purchase contract. If they are not given, they do not have the right to claim it. Despite that, the word ‘right’ is on everyone’s lips. So, it is according to this meaning of ‘right’ that God is described as not unfair but just, and that He gives everyone what he deserves, not any lesser. Briefly, justice of God does not mean what the Pandit has understood.

If justice means that the one who is entitled obtains his right, whether he wills or not, it will imply that generosity is a big injustice in the eye of the Pandit. Who does not know that pardoning, forgiveness, and giving up one’s right are the best forms of generosity and kindness.

Objection no. 7

Muslims eat meat after slaughtering in the *ḥalāl* (Islamically prescribed) way. If those animals become permissible by recitation of supplication (*du‘ā*), all animals can become permissible. If they do not become permissible by recitation of supplication, why the animal that dies its own death does not become permissible?[55]

---

54 It means that never ever someone who had the merit to be the subject of generosity and tenderness was given less than what he deserved. If disbelievers are not the subject of generosity, it is due to them lacking that merit. If mirror and black griddle cannot equally benefit from sunlight, it is due to the difference in their abilities.

55 The motive of the question is to ask about the reason of meat’s permissibility. If the permissibility comes from the supplication

Answer (1)

Someone should ask the Pandit that someone' belonging which becomes permissible by his permission, if that becomes permissible due to the permission (i.e. the ability is ignored and only the permission is considered to be the cause), it demands that after permission, his cow, his pig, his urine and faeces, and even his wife and women in his blood relation should also become lawful for the one who has been granted the permission. And if that does not become permissible by his permission, rather that is lawful in itself, then what is wrong with theft, robbery, and seizure (that morally and legally they are considered wrong and are regarded as criminal acts).

Reciting Vedas at the time of animal slaughter purifies the meat; Mahabharata's reference: Apart from this, it is mentioned in the third chapter of Mahabharata that the meat of animals upon whose slaughter Vedas are recited is pure. The one who eats that meat is counted among those who have quit eating meat. The animals who are slaughtered without recitation of Vedas are not permissible. What does the Pandit have to say regarding this? If this permissibility is because of Vedas, any animal can become permissible.

The standard of animal's permissibility is mentioned in Rig Veda: Further, What is the meaning of the specification of Rig Veda that the animals which do not

---

that you recite at the time of slaughter, then every animal should become permissible after recitation of the supplication, including pig and dog. If the permissibility comes from death, why the animal that dies its own death is not regarded as permissible?

have lower teeth and have upper teeth are eatable? If this permissibility is not because of Veda, what is the reason of impermissibility of dead animals?

Answer (2)

The forbidden animals do not have capability of accepting the effect of Allah's name: We have stated earlier that every effect requires an effective performer and a capable (of accepting the effect).[56] The mirror that illuminates and the burning glass that concentrates fiery rays,[57] the sun is effective in both, and the mirror and burning glass are affected and capable (see the first form in the table given in the second answer of the first objection). If the sun was not at that side, this illumination of the mirror and the fiery rays of the burning glass would not have come about. Similarly, if the mirror and burning glass were not at this side, the illumination and ignition could not take place (but this does not affect the perfect effectiveness of the sun).

Correspondingly, *takbīr* (saying *'Allahu Akbar'*, i.e. Allah is the greatest) and invoking any other name of Allah are the effective, and certain animals are the capable and acceptor of the effect. If the position of the effective is vacant (as in the seventh form of the mentioned table), or

---

56 This was discussed in detail in the second answer to the first objection.

57 That glass is convex, i.e. it is thick at the centre and thin towards the edges. Therefore, it refracts the sun's rays passing through the glass which later converge at a point. As a result, the heat of the entire glass concentrates onto one point, heating up the area and thus resulting in ignition of the cloth. Since this ignition is caused by this glass, the glass is called burning glass, and those rays are also metaphorically referred to as fiery rays.

something other than the name of Allah is pronounced, the permissibility will not be imaginable. Moreover, if the position of the capable is vacant (like in the third form), or there is any other animal than the specified ones, again the permissibility will be unimaginable.[58]

Objection no. 8

Muslims consider liquor as forbidden in this world. Yet, their paradise has rivers of wine. It is ironical that the same thing is forbidden here and permitted there. If such rivers exist there, what is their length and width, and where is their source located? If they are flowing, from which direction to which direction do they flow? If not, why do they not spoil?

Answer (1)

The only point worth considering in this objection is the question why a forbidden thing becomes permissible. As

58 The conclusion is that pronouncing the name of Allah is perfect effective and the animals which are permissible and eatable by the permission of God are perfect affected, and as such the effectiveness of pronouncing depends on perfectness. However, if the side of the effective is empty, i.e. Allah's name was not pronounced at the time of slaughter, or the name of someone other than Allah was pronounced, the animal in these cases will not be permissible. Correspondingly, if the effective, i.e. the name of Allah, is there but the side of the capable (affected) is vacant (such as someone shoots a bullet in the air and the shot goes in vain), or if there is a forbidden animal, such as pig or dog, then pronouncing the name of Allah in these cases will be ineffective (as if someone shoots a bullet at stone) and the animal will remain dead, not permissible. Nonetheless, in whatever situation, the perfect effectiveness of the name of Allah will remain intact.

for the question of length, width, and source, and the argument of whether the river spoils or not, are totally irrelevant for those who possess knowledge and rationality. Mere listening to such things is likely to cause suffocation to intellectuals, much less discussing them.

Among other traits of the Pandit, one is that he does not even hesitate to utter such absurdity. But we have to answer everything, and therefore out of compulsion, we put it in writing and state that there is a description of wine pool and two rivers in Rig Veda. So, we ask the same questions, why does it not spoil? What is the length and width of those pools and rivers? Where is their source located? If they are flowing, from which direction to which direction do they flow? And if they are not, why do they not spoil?

In addition, even if we say something about their length, width, source, and the direction of their flow, how will the Pandit believe us? In that case, we will be compelled to tell him to go himself and see with his own eyes, and the Pandit will reply that he cannot go. Thus, this discussion will result in nothing. Therefore, it is better for the Pandit to stay quite on this matter. Otherwise, he should be worried first about measuring the above mentioned pool and rivers. If going there is difficult, he should at least tell us the length, width, and depth of the ravine named “Rawar” and the length, width, and flowing direction of the river “Viraja”. Both of these are not in paradise, as per the narrative of Rigveda. The difficult task is to go to paradise, not to the indicated river and ravine.

Even keeping it aside, the Pandit is requested to state the measurements of rivers, streams, lakes, and ponds of this world. If this is hard as well, he should at least give

an account of the measurements and sources of rivers, streams, lakes, and ponds located in India. In the end, after this sheer ridiculousness, now I will come to the main objection.

Counterargument for the question of the same thing being forbidden in this world and permitted in paradise: The first Parva of Mahabharata mentions that alcohol was initially permissible for Brahmins, but the day Kacha was killed, his guru Shukracharya prohibited it for Brahmins. Now after the prohibition of alcohol, if Brahmins are not sent to heaven, then the answer to the above objection cannot be that the same situation is present in your religion too, and our reply will be what you will reply. In this case, however, the Pandit and all other Brahmins should ponder upon changing their religion. But if Brahmins are still allowed in the heaven, the Pandit should answer how a thing which was prohibited in this world became permissible in the heaven.

Answer (2)

If knowledge of rivers' source, length, width, depth, and direction of flow was a prerequisite to believe in their existence, none would be the believer. Even after seeing them, there will still be a room for denial.

How many people know the source and length of Ganges? Thousands (of Hindus) have seen Ganges with their own eyes, bathed in that and cleaned their sins, but even after this observation and taking advantage of it, those Hindus do not know the location of its source and measurements of its length, width, and depth. Regarding the source, it can be said

though that it originates from a certain mountain, but what about other questions? Moreover, about the cave in that mountain from which it originates, it is unknown how long that cave is and where it ends.

Subsequently, in case of flow, even the Pandit believes the wine does not rot. Thus, its answer is not required. Even then we ask, if flowing things do not rot just because of the power of God and his protection, what reduces God’s power in paradise that the wine there would be likely to rot for being steady? If the reason is that water does not stop at any place and that is why it does not rot (and the river of wine in paradise is steady), the Pandit needs to prove when did Muslims say that the wine in paradise is steady in a deep well? Further, there are thousands of lakes and ponds in the world which do not rot despite being steady due to abundance of water. What will go wrong if the same situation is in paradise and the wine there does not rot for this reason?

Logical explanation for not rotting the wine of paradise: Apart from the above, paradise does not have heat of the sun, pollution of the earth, plants, or the substances in food that cause the food to rot. The elaboration of this which should convince the Pandit, or else every intellectual will accept, is that everyone agrees that some foods contain more amount of waste matter than others. When this is the case, it will not be impossible if there is a food which does not contain any amount of waste at all?

Comparison of heavenly diet with *rūḥ hawāyī* in subtlety: Moreover, the hustle and bustle of earth’s faculty of growth (*quwwat-e-nāmiyah*) enables plant cells to grow,

leaving behind other dense elements. Then, the manipulation of the indicated force separates grain and fruits from other components of plants. Afterwards, human removes husk and straw followed by crushing and filtering it with a steel sieve. But even after this much process of refinement and filtration, the waste material is not fully removed. The stomach, however, manages to separate that waste material. Subsequently, the liver separates urine, and at this point, yellow bile (*ṣafrā'*), black bile (*saudā'*), blood (*dam*), and phlegm (*balgham*) part from each other. After that, as the blood travels to heart, its warmth vaporizes the blood, and this vapor spreads throughout the body. This vapor is what we have termed "*rūḥ hawāyī*" (pneumatic spirit).[59] If this vapor somehow freezes as the water does,

59 Once the food is processed in stomach, the waste material separates and reaches intestines, and the primary material which looks thick similar to rice pottage and is called 'chyle' goes to liver where it is reprocessed and splits up into the above mentioned four humors (*akhlāṭ*). Subsequently, fresh blood goes to heart and gets refined, and thereby appears a subtle vapor which is in medicine known as "vital spirit" (*rūḥ ḥaiwānī*), that is the essence of life. The learned author has referred to this spirit by *"rūḥ hawāyī"* (pneumatic spirit). Thereafter, that vapor is infused into brain, and after some further process it transforms into another subtle vapor which is termed "psychic spirit" (*rūḥ nafsānī*). This psychic spirit is the driving force for all bodily functions, sensations, and movements, including five external senses (hearing, sight, smell, taste, and touch) and five internal senses (common sense, retentive imagination, compositive imagination, estimative faculty, and memory). Then, that subtle vapor moves to liver where it is influenced by its natural faculty. Natural faculties are four (nourishment, growth, reproduction, and formation). Thus, that vapor in this form is called natural spirit (*rūḥ ṭabī'ī*), and the three forms of spirits are collectively called 'the three spirits'. The learned author used the expression "*rūḥ hawāyī*" which covers all three forms (Note from the translator: this term has been coined by the author himself and as such no exact English alternative of this

and then it is eaten, surely this diet will not make any waste. For, this diet is actually nothing but air. In this case, what we have eaten may maximum be discharged through a burp to clear the stomach. If such a thing falls in water, it will never spoil.

Back to the point, suppose if the land (in paradise) is made of such a material, all animals, plants, and inanimate objects therein will be free from excretion. Hence, there will not be any probability of spoiling or rotting in any way.[60]

---

could be found. I have translated it as 'pneumatic spirit'. The knowledgeable readers are requested to convey us if they could come up with a better translation.) As the context did not demand for elaboration, he himself did not bring up the whole discussion. Nevertheless, it should be kept in mind that the immaterial soul which is one of the secrets of Allah and which has been referred in Quran as 'one of the commands of Lord' is a different thing. The above-mentioned vapors should not be perceived as the reality of this soul.

60 The learned author has explained such a reality in illustrative manner which is agreed upon and which relates to every individual. All other blessings of paradise, its fruits and foods should be compared to this, as this quality is not limited to wine alone. This is a fine example of drawing analogy between an imperceptible and a perceptible, not only that but such a perceptible that is always connected to every human rather every animal. This clears many other potential doubts as well.

The reason of absence of filth in paradise: One such doubt is that people of paradise will stay there for eternity, and they will have plenty of foods and drinks, and consequently they will definitely, as the observation suggests, defecate and urinate. This will result in creating piles of filth and oceans of urine in the heaven. Another doubt is that when the people of paradise will have perpetual supply of quality food, and it will be digested well, and there will not be slightest illness or discomfort, then constant growth of body in length and width is very likely. Since this situation will remain forever, a time will come when every person in paradise will outgrow Himalaya Mountain.

However, a careful consideration in the light of the above discussion will blow away such doubts as the wind blows tiny

This much clarification is sufficient for intellectuals and just people. As for ignorant and uninformed, even if they are shown with their own eyes and even if they experience themselves, still they will hardly believe. Even if they are convinced, their tongue is in their control and so they will never admit.

Wine is forbidden in this world then why is it not forbidden in paradise? As far as the permissibility of wine in paradise, despite being prohibited in this world, is concerned, its rationale can also be drawn from the above discussion. To elaborate, wine has two characteristics; intoxication and delightfulness, and these two characteristics are contradictory. Intoxication is the loss of consciousness; mild intoxication causes mild unconsciousness and severe one causes severe unconsciousness. Whereas, delight requires consciousness,[61] as

---

straws. Looking from this viewpoint reveals that the fruits and foods there will be akin to pneumatic spirit; totally weightless. The digestion will be through a burp, after which no portion of food will remain in the body, thereby rendering defecation and urination out of discussion. Moreover, this leaves no room even for the question of abnormal growth of bodies. The only thing that will remain in the body after eating and drinking from those blessings will be the feeling of joy, delight, pleasure, and strength which are mere qualities, and qualities do not cause the body to grow. The answers of the author have been derived from sayings of the Prophet (PBUH), but simplifying this content through illustration of pneumatic spirit is his distinction.

Overall, we are grateful to the Pandit whose nonsense blither prompted the author to demonstrate these realities in such a way that no one before him has ever done.

61 It is because delight is a certain degree of happiness which demands for knowledge of knowledge. That is to say, an image, which is generally cherished by heart, appears in mind, and the mind enjoys involving with that image. The apprehension of that certain image is knowledge, and enjoyment with that knowledge

the state of unconsciousness negates every distress and contentment, sorrow and happiness (i.e. all emotions will disappear in the absence of knowledge of knowledge). Therefore, the union of these two will be like the union of heat and cold in all elemental compounds (*murakkabāt-e-‘unṣuriyyah*, i.e. the three categories of creations; animals, plants, and inanimate objects). However, since heat and cold are contradictory, both cannot be the effect of a single thing, and consequently we have to acknowledge the existence of water and fire. Similarly, intoxication and delightfulness cannot be the effect of a single thing due to the indicated reason. Thus, we have to admit that intoxication is the effect of a different element and delightfulness of a different one.[62] Now, if that element, whose effect was intoxication, is somehow removed from the wine through a heavenly sieve, only the element of delight and pleasure will remain and that wine will be admissible by every rational person.

The reason behind prohibition of the former type of wine (i.e. the intoxicating one), in the opinion of all intellectuals and the believers of its prohibition including Hindus, is this intoxication. When Shukracharya forbade alcohol, the reason was only the intoxication, as it is clearly

---

depends on the knowledge of that knowledge which has been referred here as the feeling of happiness. For, if this knowledge of knowledge is absent, the state will be named unconsciousness, and the happiness will also disappear. As a result, neither will there be any delight nor contentment.

62 In order to increase this particular effect, a certain quantity of alcohol is added to good quality foreign wines. It must be noted that in Arabic, the word *“sharāb”* is used for every beverage, no matter if it is a syrup or juice, be it intoxicating or non-intoxicating, or if it is plain water. But in Urdu, this word *“sharāb”* is specific to intoxicating drinks, for which the Arabic word is *“khamar”*.

mentioned in Mahabharata. Specifically, Muslims hold the view of its prohibition only till it contains intoxication. If wine turns into vinegar, and the quality of intoxication fades away, then they do not hesitate to drink it. In addition, the same reason of prohibition is mentioned in Quran, Ḥadīth, and Islamic jurisprudence.

In short, the cause of prohibition is intoxication, and since it is connected to a different element, its separation is possible. In the event of separation, only the element of delightfulness will remain in the wine. Apparently, whoever drinks wine does it for the sake of delight not for unconsciousness. The word of Allah affirms pleasure for the wine which is the essence of delight, and negates intoxication which is the cause of prohibition, as the following verse testifies:

لَّا لَغْوٌ فِيهَا وَلَا تَأْثِيمٌ

> Wherein [results] no ill speech or commission of sin. [At-Tur, 52:23]

Another reason for permitting pure wine in paradise: Besides, the prohibition of intoxicants in this world was due to the likelihood of not observing the commandments of Allah in the state of insobriety. This likelihood is limited to this worldly life, as all commandments are abolished after one's death. In paradise, everyone will be free from all obligations and duties. Thus, permitting the drinking there will not lead to any harm.

Objection no. 9

Muslims bury their dead, thereby making the land impure, so burning the dead is better.

Answer (1)

Hindus burn their dead, thereby polluting the air and making it stink. This air then causes many diseases, so burying is better.[63]

Answer (2)

Coming to this world and departing from here, i.e. life and death, are not in our control. Rather, as the Urdu poet Zauq says:

لائی حیات آئے قضا لے چلی چلے　　اپنی خوشی نہ آئے نہ اپنی خوشی چلے[64]

Coming here is difficult, and going away is not pleasant as well.

Everyone is aware of unpleasant and terrible nature of death, but some people may be unclear about the difficulty in coming here. It is therefore stated that everyone is at least informed that soul[65] is a subtle matter and body is a dense composition of dust. The soul is a pure gleam from the heavenly world, whereas the body is a handful of dust from this subjacent world. As a poet says:

چراغ مردہ کجا شمع آفتاب کجا　　ببیں تفاوت رہ از کجاست تا بہ کجا[66]

---

63 The stink of the air hurts every mind. Its effects are not limited to animal beings rather plants are also affected by its smoke. That is why the place of cremation is kept away from residential areas. On the contrary, all physical effects in case of burial remain confined to two yards of the land.

64 Translation: Life brought me here and I came, when death took me away, I went away with it. Neither did I come of my own will, nor will I go of my own accord.

65 Soul here refers to the heavenly soul not the pneumatic spirit which was discussed earlier.

66 Translation: Where is a dead lantern, and the candle of the sun where? See the difference, it is from where to where.

Considering the utter contrast and incompatibility of nature, arrival of the pure soul to this world is so difficult, by testimony of intellect, that departure from here will not be as difficult and unpleasant. When this is the case, death was already extremely unpleasant and out of control, now life, i.e. arrival of the soul to the body, is even more burdensome and out of control. Undoubtedly, it was the force of some mighty (and that is the might of none but the Omnipotent Being) that brought a pure entity like soul to this world.

What is the fault of the dead and his heirs that they should be regarded responsible for impurity of land? When death is not in our control and with our agreement, and the life, upon which the death is dependant, is also not in our control and with our agreement, what is their fault in the impurity of the dead body that they should be made responsible to compensate for it? It was due to the command of God and His will that we had to come to this world against our will and choice. After coming here, thanks to the long company and good service, when the soul, caught in the love for body, has submitted to it, it has to depart, willingly or unwillingly, to comply with the command of the one who is the owner of destiny.

Until the pure soul stays in this subjacent world, it keeps the filthy body, which is made of semen, fed on blood, and is the source of excretion, as pure as the sun keeps the dark earth illuminated with its light. When it is compelled to depart, and the dusty body returns to its filthy state, is this due to the fault of the soul that it or its heirs are made responsible to compensate for the impurity of the earth, and they have to worry about burning the body or turning it into dust?

In order to prevent the land from impurity, the Pandit should keep faeces in his pocket and urine in his pots: Admittedly, food is the source of life and means of survival for human being, and excretion is a result of eating food. Former is the cure of inner craving and latter is the way to get rid of waste matter. Both are in our control and both have some scope of choice.

The scope of choice in eating, in spite of uncontrolled craving, is very evident. As for excretion, despite its uncontrollability, it also definitely has room for choice. Going to a certain place on our own foot and with our own will and sometimes applying some force from our side is not something that anybody might be unaware of. On the contrary, we do not have such control and scope of choice in life and death, and we cannot even decide the place of birth or death; neither our hands and feet have any role to play in it nor does our force. Besides, the faeces and urine are filthier than the filth caused by death, and their stench is more than that of death, especially in the beginning.[67] Therefore, if burying the dead in the land is prohibited in order to prevent the land from getting filthy and stinky, why polluting the land of God with faeces and urine should be permitted? Thus, the Pandit and his adherents must not let the faeces and urine fall on the ground. Rather, they should keep the faeces in their pockets and urine in their pots. Then, they should let it dry and burn it to prevent the land and air from filth and stench.

Alas! The objections being raised against Muslims are of such kind whose standard is visible to everyone. Someone

67 The stench strikes harder when we first enter toilet.

should ask the Pandit that while burial makes the land filthy and stinky, whether the faeces and urine produce fragrance. In fact, the latter is so stinky that its stench strikes the brain as soon as it comes out, making the land filthy and the wind smelly, and leaving outspread and wide-ranging effects. The dead, on the other hand, are not like this; at the time of death, they retain their appearance, their charm, and their glow. Thereafter, they are cleaned, bathed, and perfumed and then buried, causing no inconvenience to any human being or polluting the land. When the body decomposes after the burial, humans and animals suffer no unease because of it.

The very basis of the objection that burial makes the land filthy is wrong: The land seemingly becomes filthy for few days, but in reality the dead's filthiness does not affect the land, rather the land's purity influences the dead. This is the reason why, after few days, the body blends with the land, and the filth and stench fade away. This clearly proves that the land is effective and the dead is passive and acceptor of the effect. Indisputably, the effective transfers its effect to the acceptor of the effect not other way round. Otherwise, the effective will not remain an effective and the passive will not be called passive. That is why sunlight lights up the faeces and urine but the sunlight does not get filthy by this. Thus, the land does not really get filthy and stinky, but it is only the components of excretion that get filthy and stinky.

Until[68] those components are present there, we cannot perform the acts which are conditioned with purity

68 **Clarification of a doubt:** At this point, someone might object that your religion stipulates the purity of place as a condition for validity of prayer (salat / *namāz*). When the land, according to

of the place. The same rule applies to the case of excretion as well.[69] But since we do not see any problem in burying, no objection can be raised against us regarding excretion.

Benefits of burying and drawbacks of burning: The point is that when life and death are not in our control, no matter the deceased is buried, left in open, burned, or decomposed in water, we are not to be blamed for turning these clean and pure things into filthy and stinky. God separated the soul from this dusty body, and these things belong to Him, and so it is between Him and these things. Having said that, burial is more covering for the deceased, and it is not the cause of any problem for living beings.

Keeping in open air and drowning in water causes unpleasantness to both nose and eyes; the stench bothers the nose and the sight fills with disgust. Burning in fire although does not cause that long lasting stench and disgust, but the situation at the time of burning can only be described by participants and the people living around. Furthermore, the fear of water getting contaminated and spread of diseases due to the pollution of air is there on one side, and the damage caused by corruption of the elements to the four elements on the other. Both of the pollution and

your above argument, is the effective and the dead body is acceptor of the effect, and the acceptor cannot transfer its effect to the effective, then why do you not pray at that place? Moreover, why do you not apply the same rule for excretion, and why do you not pray at the place of excretion? Why do you call that place impure? To reply to this objection, the author contends…

69 Until its components are visible, we do not declare the place as pure. Once they have vanished and disappeared, that piece of land becomes suitable to perform acts of worship, as land is originally pure.

corruption are not found in burial. Rather, after break-up of composition, the four elements of the dead body reach their respective positions. This is the reason why the quantity of dust, water, air, and fire always remain the same.

Another benefit of burying: Apart from this, the damage caused by the heat of fire to faculty of growth (*quwwat-e-nāmiyah*) of the land is evident, and strengthening of that faculty by burial of the dead is also not a secret.

The damage to the faculty of growth by the heat is self-explanatory. As for the strength of this faculty through burial, the reason behind this is that the human body comes into existence after a series of process by the faculty of growth. If grain and fruits contribute in the bodily growth of the human body, regardless of the fact that this growth gradually happens over time which itself is the function of this faculty, these edibles have also attained their form, color, smell, and taste as a result of faculty of growth.

Essentially, the growth faculty had to perform a lot of operations in order to grow these ingredients from the land. After the burial, this faculty gets these elements all in one place. That is why the increased fertility in burial ground and its surroundings is not surprising. Unquestionably, since human waste comes from the food which is an outcome of the growth faculty's operations, it significantly increases this faculty of the land. That being so, the human body which is more capable than human waste will surely have this potential too. When its waste is such efficient, the efficiency of the whole body which is the epitome of the four elements can only be imagined. In short, the destructive nature of the heat of fire and the productive quality of the human body in favor of land is undeniable. This is the reason why cremation

grounds of Hindus have no sign of greenery, while Muslim graveyards are full of greenery.

Burial meets nature's demand while cremation opposes it: In addition, when a well-wisher father goes on a trip, he hands over his child to his biological mother not to his stepmother. When this is the case, the appropriate action will be to hand over the body to soil, not to fire.

The soul is equivalent to guardian with respect to the body, as appears by its supervision and fostering, and the soil is akin to a kind mother, as signified by its birth from the soil. Taking this into account, in the event of soul's journey (which it makes towards heaven at the time of death), burning the body instead of burying in soil will be similar to handing over the child to his stepmother instead of biological mother.

Burial is also necessary to maintain the balance of elements: Suppose if someone has a flock of pigeons and another person's pigeon voluntarily joins this flock; he does not steal it, or someone's goat joins his herd of goats, then the owner of the flock or herd has the duty to segregate another person's animal and hand it over to him. But others do not have the right to confiscate his flock or herd and kill them all behind his back. That being the case, the appropriate move will be the burial of the dead body in the land so that water, fire, and air get separated and go to their respective places, or the spheres of water, air, and fire pull their corresponding elements to themselves. To elaborate, the natural motion of soil, water, air, and fire towards their spheres is either of two kinds; either they move themselves, as the majority of Greek philosophers say, or the spheres have gravitational force, as English philosophers claim. In

whatever case, it is appropriate to bury in land and not to burn in fire. Because, this body is from top to bottom made of dust, but due to the presence of moisture, density, and warmth, it seems that some elements of water, air, and fire are also incorporated in the body. The body did not steal any of these elements. If the body is buried in the soil, it will break-up the composition and will disengage every element, and then those elements will either travel to their respective places on their own, or their origins will attract and absorb them. Whereas, burning them in fire will destroy all the elements.

Love and respect also demand for burial rather than burning: Even regardless of the above argument, the love among relatives is obvious. Not only that, rather if you look closely, unlike other species, all humans are close relatives, after all they are children of the same parents. This is one of the results of this relation that everyone protects the other. The protection in the lifetime is beyond any doubt. Even after the death, one does not want to leave the dead body of his relative. That is why at the time of departure of the dead body, they scream and cry their hearts out. When this is the case, and they cannot keep the dead with them, this is not the law of the love to burn it down and turn it into ashes. This is not something a lover will do. However, there is no harm in cleaning the body from external filth, dressing him well, and placing it somewhere carefully. But no one will understand this except those whose hearts are filled with affection. How can a heartless barbarian understand this so that we could expect his endorsement! And what will the one who has never tasted passion be aware of so that we could hope his affirmation.

Objection no. 10

Objection on *Barzakh*:[70] Muslims say that after death, a person stays in a lock-up until the Day of Judgement. On the Day of Judgement, he will have a reckoning and will receive his reward or punishment. But this is totally wrong, as keeping in lock-up is injustice. Rather, one receives reward or punishment immediately after his death through reincarnation.

Answer (1)

If delay in the reward and punishment is injustice, then even the time that passes before death, which is the time for reincarnation, cannot be considered justice.[71] Rather, the concept of 'give and take' would have been more appropriate so that a person would get the reward or punishment immediately after he commits a sin. Thus, this delay is also meaningless.[72] If postponing to the Day of

---

70 *Barzakh* is an Arabic word meaning 'obstacle', 'hindrance', 'separation', or 'barrier'. In Islamic eschatology, *Barzakh* is generally viewed as the barrier between the physical and spiritual worlds. *Barzakh* designates a place between hell and heaven, where the soul resides after death, and experiences his own heaven or hell, until the resurrection on Judgement Day.

71 We see that sometimes a person lives 60-70 years after committing a sin. If any delay in getting the reward and punishment is injustice, God will be accused of injustice, and that is impossible. What leads to an impossible is itself impossible. Therefore, the claim that the delay in reward and punishment is injustice proves to be invalid.

72 When both reward and punishment depend on reincarnation and delay is injustice and the reincarnation is not possible without death, it implies that a person should die immediately after committing a good or bad deed so that the reincarnation could

Judgement is injustice, this is injustice too. And if this is justice, then that is also not injustice.

Answer (2)

Proof of the Judgement Day and the reality of reward and punishment: Things which are composed of such constituents that are made for different purposes, for example farming, in which grain is for humans and husk and chaff are for animals, such things are ultimately disengaged and sent to their respective places and used accordingly. For example, crops are one day reaped, harvested, and crushed, and the grain is separated from husk, and then both are stored in separate pots and containers. Later, husk and chaff are periodically fed to animals, and the grain is consumed by humans as per their need. Moreover, they even differentiate in their consumption so as the quality grain they keep for themselves and the substandard one is given to servants and butlers or fed to animals.

Coming to the point, the reality of the reward and punishment: Upon looking closely, we found that this material world is also composed of such constituents that are made for different purposes. Each and every part and each and every segment of this world manifest that they have been created for varying tasks, each having distinct characteristics; earth possesses different qualities and water

take place, the reward or punishment is not delayed, and God does not get the blame of injustice. It is because the reincarnation is dependent on death; it cannot take place in lifetime. Thus, this reasoning is also evident in invalidating the theory of reincarnation.

holds different merits, believers have disparate goals and disbelievers are here for some other objectives, scholars' aim is non-identical to that of beggars, clever and stupid are distinguishable, generous and miser are distinct, valiant and coward are unlike, men and women are not similar. In a nutshell, each and everything has varying qualities and characteristics.

ہر گلے را رنگ و بوئے دیگر ست[73]

The same thing should happen to this world that one day it should be split up and each component should be separated so that the pious are sent to their abode and sinners to their prison. This arrival to their respective places is what we call the reward and punishment.

Proof of the Judgement Day and the relation of reward and punishment with it: In addition to the above, if you look at the universe as a whole, it is similar to a human's or animal's body. Just as all organs, like eyes, ears, hands, and feet, are there for different purposes, so are components of the universe, such as the earth and sky, for different uses. Just like the four elements of this material body (i.e. fire, air, water, and earth) have distinct properties, so do the celestial (*'ulwiyyāt*) and terrestrial (*sufliyyāt*) bodies of this temporary world and desires have distinct nature and distinct effects.[74] When some change

73 Every flower has different color and smell.

74 Shah Waliullah Dehlavi has named this composition of the universe *"Shakhṣ-e-Akbar"* (greater person). There is an unseen and subtle entity that encloses our material and visible body (which *ṣūfiyā'*, i.e. Muslim mystics, term as *barzakh*) which, unlike the visible body, cannot be pointed at, and which possesses the faculties of hearing, sight, smell, taste, and sensation (i.e. the five senses). But the

occurs in the original temperament of the body, owing to an imbalance of humors, this state is called illness.[75] And if the

instruments and manifestations of these faculties, i.e. ear, eye, nose, tongue, and skin, are visible on our physical body which can be pointed at (i.e. we can point at any of these by our fingers and that is why they are called the five external senses, unlike those actual faculties which employ these physical organs for their function, as those faculties cannot be pointed at). In addition, the above-mentioned unseen and subtle entity undeniably possesses some other faculties as well. These faculties are called the five internal senses, at which we cannot point by our fingers. Their names are: *ḥiss-e-mushtarak* (common sense), *khayāl* (retentive imagination), *quwwat-e-mutaṣarrifah* (compositive imagination), *waham* (estimative faculty), and *ḥāfiẓah* (memory). No sane person can deny their existence. Similarly, a metaphysical spirit encloses the *"Shakhṣ-e-Akbar"*, and that spirit holds cognitive faculties just like our spirit. The author is referring to that spirit as *"Rūḥ-e-Āʻẓam"* (the grand spirit), whose faculties are the original source of our faculties, common sense, retentive imagination, compositive imagination etc., and our faculties are derived from there. There are even instruments and manifestations for its faculties which are named heavenly spirits or angels by Muslims. To deny their existence just because they are hidden from our sight and they cannot be pointed at, is equal to denying our own faculties, common sense and retentive imagination etc., since they are also hidden from us and we cannot point at them as we can do to the instruments of the five senses; ear and eye and nose etc. This denial is undoubtedly irrational and ridiculous, and this is a widespread problem among some big materialistic nations who have neglected the knowledge of metaphysics and the realities. Here, the author only made a brief reference, as going in details would have carried the discussion away from the topic due to exhaustiveness of this subject. The author has discussed this subject in his other write-ups. We have also avoided expounding in here for the same reason.

75 Human body is made of four humors; black bile (*saudā'*), yellow bile (*ṣafrā'*), phlegm (*balgham*) and blood (*dam*). These humors are not evenly distributed in every individual. Rather, any of these humors is dominant in everyone. The state of the body formed by these humors collectively is called 'temperament', and the collective state prescribed by the Omniscient Creator for an individual is his default temperament. When there is an excess or

soul was to leave the body due to this malfunction, this is the death. In the same way, if some change occurs in the original composition of this temporary world, because of imbalance in constituents (which compose the *Shakhṣ-e-Akbar* or aggregate universe) or excessive desire, and it gives birth to a new state, this will be called the sign of the Judgement Day.[76] Further, if this results in separation of the grand spirit (*Rūḥ-e-Ā'ẓam*), which is for the aggregate universe similar to the human spirit as appears from the arrangement and orderliness of the universe, from the aggregate universe, that will be the Judgement Day.[77]

Why occurrence of the Judgement Day is necessary, and reality of the reward and punishment: When this is so, just as decomposition of humans' or animals' bodies

---

deficiency in the default proportion of humors, it negatively affects the usual functions of the body.

76 Only Allah has the comprehensive knowledge of how many constituents compose the *Shakhṣ-e-Akbar*, or the aggregate universe. We are citing one example to give an idea; one of the constituents is justice, i.e. every human being should be respectful for others' rights, which is now diminishing. The urge to encroach others' rights is so high that absurd excuses are made in an attempt to justify this wrongdoing. Obscenity is on rise, degrading humans to the level of animals. There are more such constituents whose origin can be traced by outspread corruption in moral values. When all such constituents will shatter, that will be the time for occurrence of the Judgement Day. It seems likely that the corruption would take few more centuries or millennia to reach its peak, but it does not mean that this is not a corruption, or this is not a sign of the Judgement Day, or the Judgement Day is not real. Few millennia compared to the age of this universe are like a single day to a year. In view of this comparison, saying the Judgement Day is near is not questionable.

77 The summary of the arguments up to this point is that occurrence of the Judgement Day is possible, and it is not a far-fetched theory. Next, the author is proving the necessity and need for it.

after death is unavoidable, so is disengagement of components of the universe after the separation (of the grand spirit from *Shakhṣ-e-Akbar*). Furthermore, just as merging every component of the human body with its sphere after decomposition is necessary (the element of water merges with water and that of soil merges with soil and so on), so is going of every constituent of the universe to its place after disengagement. Therefore, the pious will (necessarily) go to paradise and sinners to hell, and this is the reward and punishment.[78]

Why were the reward and punishment delayed and why is this not injustice? Moreover, we get food cooked by chef or get dress stitched by tailor, and the wage is paid in exchange of this service. If we find their work desirable, we pay their wages, otherwise we demand from him compensation for ruining the cloth or food. Since this thing can only be known after the work is completed, the wage is also paid afterwards. In addition, if the work cannot be completed by an individual and in a single day, rather many people have to work for many days to complete it, then it takes even longer to get the salary, especially when the work is done on contract basis.

---

78 The bodies of humans and animals are made of elements of fire, air, water, and soil. Once soul departs from the body, each element goes and merges with its origin; heat merges with fire, moisture with water, air with air, and soil with soil. In the same way, components of the aggregate universe (*Shakhṣ-e-Akbar*) are people, some of whom are the people of paradise and some are the people of hell. Upon the grand spirit's separation from that, it is inevitable for its components too to reach their respective original abodes, i.e. paradise or hell, and this is called the reward and punishment.

This was about wages. As far as the reward and punishment are concerned, there is nothing wrong at all with the delay because injustice is only the delay in paying others' rights, and a person becomes liable with others' rights only in sale or lease contracts. In the case of reward and punishment, one does not become liable for anything that any delay would be tantamount to injustice.

Additionally, it is self-evident that unlike the delay in paying others' right, which is wrong, the delay in obtaining one's own right is praise-worthy. Thus, the delay in punishment for one's right cannot be considered wrong. As for the reward, that is not a mandatory right that the delay could be blame-worthy. However,[79] the delay in causing a person's right to be paid may seem wrong, but all religions and all intelligent individuals testify that Allah has commanded the rulers of this world to uphold fairness and justice. It is obligatory from God to hasten to cause him receive what can be received in this world. But the matter of the hereafter is different. God is not only the ruler of his slaves, but He is also like their parents rather kinder and more merciful. So, if He postpones retrieving their rights for the hour of need, and take it and give it to them when they need it the most, it will be better than them losing it before that time. The most desperate time of need will be when the physical world will be shattered and destroyed, and there will no longer be any channel or means or

79 An objection might be raised here that, undoubtedly, the delay in the punishment for violation of one's right as well as the delay in the reward (which is given out of generosity not in return of a service) is not injustice. But the delay in making the violator pay someone else's right seems against justice. So, this is the response from the author.

medium of earning. That is the time we refer to by the Judgement Day. At that time, there will be no channels or mediums except God's mercy or, seemingly, one's due rights.[80]

Delay only occurs in the reward and punishment which do not have slightest scope of injustice: Now that the above has been borne in mind, listen further! This world has been created for the sake of worship, as we have elaborated in the arguments for invalidity of reincarnation. Obviously, the worship of God is his obligatory right because human being is owned by God, and the one who is owned is obliged to glorify and submit to his owner. Nothing becomes due in return of an obligatory right, but if someone wants to give something as a reward from his side, it will be entirely up to him.[81] Thus, whatever slaves are given for their desirable service is just a reward, not their wage that it could be considered obligatory and any delay could be tantamount to injustice. And the compensation of delinquency in his duties is called punishment. The punishment is the right of the punisher, any delay in that is the delay in recovering his own

80 The summary of the reply is that in this world, the requirement of justice is pressing. That is why all the commandments related to this world manifest the urgency of causing people's right to be paid quickly. While in the hereafter, delay happens due to the pressing requirement of tenderness and generosity over there. They will receive things in the hereafter that will be beneficial for that world, in compensation of their rights that were due in this world. Had they received their rights in here, they would have been deprived of those privileges over there.

81 The payment of a due right which was obligatory to be paid does not make one entitled to any reward or gratuity. To illustrate, government does not recompense anyone for paying his taxes or duties, but in the event of non-payment, a prompt arrest is made.

right, not in paying someone else's right so that it could be injustice.

The proof of the Judgement Day and the essence of worship: The answer to the objection of the Pandit is only that the delay in the reward and punishment is not injustice. However, to prove the Judgement Day, it is also worth mentioning that worship, in the manner that pleases God, is imaginable only when humility, submission, invocation, and imploration take place against names and attributes of God.[82] Since, worship is the name of (display of) humility and submission (*'ijz wa niyāz*), which is not possible unless the one showing humility and submission is in need of or is afraid of the one to whom he is displaying humility and submission. For the need, it is necessary that he (the one to whom the need is directed, or *muḥtāj ilayhi*) possesses the thing which the needy does not have and which will meet his requirement.

As for the fear, if it is from God then the fear is also unimaginable leaving out the element of requirement. The reason is that 'fear' here denotes the worry about losing something. If one gets deprived of something because of God's anger, that thing was given by God Himself. There is no one beside Him who could give something to someone. So, the result of anger will be the deprivation of thing that was given by Him. Since 'fear' connotes deprivation of

82 Bowing down to someone or admiring and glorifying him are based on his attributes. Sitting respectfully in front of a scholar is because of his attribute of knowledge. Genuflection of poor before rich, with the hope of some benefit, is due to his richness. Kneeling before a powerful ruler is done on the basis of his power, by the fear of harm, or the hope of fetching benefit. The ground of bending the knee to a beautiful person is his beauty. To put it briefly, the display of humility and submission is always based on some attribute and one's own need.

necessities, it unarguably implies that, in the state of anger, one is deprived of human necessities. Overall, (the conclusion is that) in whatever situation, the need is always directed towards God. He possesses everything that is needful for us.

The meaning of God's possession of necessities: However, the possession of necessities does not mean that they are present in forms of gold and silver, money and wealth, because if those necessities are existent on their own without being created by anyone, then firstly, they all will be God,[83] and secondly, making use of them and proffering them will be impossible, since in that case, just like God, they will not be in anyone's control. And if they are creation of someone else, it will suggest the presence of another God. In other words, the oneness of God which is acknowledged by both parties will be proven invalid.

The meaning of God's creation and His bestowal: Furthermore, if they are creation of God, their creation would be in the meaning of apportioning them from His existence according to their capacity, like the sun shares out its light to the moon, stars, and particles etc. But just as it does not make any difference to the sun (it does not reduce the sun's light or brightness despite it being limited) and even after this, it illuminates other things, similarly things come into existence from the (limitless) existence of God and it does not make any difference to God's existence. If this was not the case, but the existence (which is the essence of all bestowals) was a

83 It is because, the divine status solely depends on being self-standing; God is called God only because His existence is His own, it was not given any anyone else. Therefore, attributing the self-standing nature to something will be synonymous with claiming it to be God. A thorough discussion on this topic can be read in *Barāhīn-e-Qāsmiyyah*.

separate thing, it would have again led to the acknowledgment of multiple Gods (which has just been discussed).

To sum up, the method of inventing and fulfilling necessities is that something is apportioned from His attributes, or because of the demand of some of His attributes, the creations are bestowed on. For example, if He provided sustenance out of the demand of His attribute 'the provider', it will imply that God has provided the sustenance, which is a creation, after inventing it and giving it a part of His existence, by virtue of His attribute 'the provider'.

The nature of Deity and His characteristics: Since all attributes depend on existence in such a way that they cannot be imagined without existence, we have to admit that all attributes essentially have the same relationship with existence as the sun does with light and the fire with heat, i.e. they are derived from these sources. And since the existence can be bestowed and taken back, all the attributes can also be given and taken back.

However,[84] just like a burning glass heats up more due to the difference in capability, and an ordinary glass (which is not convex rather flat surfaced and clear) lights up more, similarly having excess and deficiency in effects of attributes on creations is not a big deal.[85]

---

84 A question might pop up here that just as benefit of the sun, i.e. its light, is common for all; there is no excess or lack, so should be the benefits of the existence of God and, correspondingly, His characteristics should be common for all. In effect, however, there are numerous differences; some are healthy and fit and some are sick and weak, some are poor and some are rich and so on. Why this difference is there? The author responds to this question.

85 The summary of the answer is that the concerned difference appears due to the difference in capabilities, not from the actual effective cause, i.e. existence, as its benefits are common for all.

That said, the sun's light transfers to glass etc., but its quality of being the source of light does not transfer. Correspondingly, the existence of God and its subsidiaries, i.e. the above mentioned attributes, pass to others, but His property of being the source of existence and source of attributes does not transfer to others. So, this is what we call the Godhood and its characteristics, such as being creator and independent etc. This evidently suggests that God is the one to whom the needs are directed and He is the giver, and that everyone besides him is needy for and receiver of his bestowals. And this is the essence of humility and submission.[86]

How can God be worshipped perfectly? Overall, every attribute of God requires that, with respect to it, some sort of humility and submission is displayed. This is equivalent to showing humility before an expert physician, or kneeling down before a knowledgeable person. As this case has different skills, that case has various needs. But the attributes of God are limitless (in terms of the status and quantity of each attribute), just as the necessities of humans are endless. Thus, if humility and submission is performed,

86 Previously it was said that worship, in the manner that pleases God, is imaginable only when total humility, submission, invocation, and imploration take place against names and attributes of God. After its explanation, the author pointed, through this above sentence, to the same content which started the discussion and led to elucidation of worship. But the author has to discuss some points related to the worship which will include a description of properties of attributes and the reason for Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) being the chief of the first and the last men. All this is just a preface to the original objective, i.e. to prove the Judgement Day, which will be taken into consideration after completing this discussion.

elaborately (*bit-tafṣīl*) or briefly (*bil-ijmāl*), with regard to each attribute, the worship will be complete and perfect otherwise it will be incomplete and imperfect.

What is the standard of perfect worship? Elaborative humility and submission are not possible, because limitless attributes require limitless time. Though it is possible briefly but only by the person who is the 'epitome of ranks' (*khātam al-marātib*). To elucidate, attributes are dependent on one another; power (*qudrat*) depends on intention (*irādah*) and intention depends on knowledge.[87] But knowledge does not depend on intention or power or anything else. Moreover, this dependence is of such sort that the intention and power are not even imaginable without knowledge. Thus, we have to acknowledge that even the existence of intention and power is dependent on the existence of knowledge.[88] Otherwise, if these were independent in existence, they would not have to be dependent in performance.

Some of attributes depend on others: The relation of color with cloth does not depend, for this reason, on the hand of dyer.[89] It is also possible for the cloth to get color

87 The meaning of dependence of attributes is that when the divine will intends to do something, the action gets performed by the divine power. But the power should be preceded by intention and the intention must follow the knowledge of what is to be done. Therefore, power depends on intention and intention depends on knowledge.

88 Dependence of intention and power on knowledge in terms of performance is evident, but the existence of both attributes also depends on the existence of knowledge. This has been elaborated more in *Barāhīn-e-Qāsmiyyah*.

89 The coloring of a cloth is independent of any other attribute and so the effect does not depend on the hand of the dyer.

without the dyer. If the air causes the cloth to fall in a color pot, it will give the same result as the dyer would have given.

When this is the case,[90] the difference among the attributes will be similar to that between sunshine and sunbeam; just like sunshine is the end of sunbeams,[91] and therefore the existence of sunshine depends on the appearance of sunbeams (i.e. on the appearance of millions of rays that originate from the sun), in the same way the depending attributes would also be having the same kind of relationship.[92] As a result, the upper and lower degrees would come into being. The attributes which are dependent would be in the lower degree and the ones on which other attributes depend would be in the higher degree.

The creations,[93] on the other hand, since everything they have is bestowal, i.e. manifestation, of attributes, as noted earlier, and then there is difference of capabilities, the emergence of these attributes will also be subject to differences.

Who can be the epitome of attributes? So the person who is the best embodiment of an attribute and who is the epitome of attributes (*khātam al-ṣifāt*), i.e. there is no attribute above him that can embody or can be bestowed on any

90 When there is dependence on each other and attributes have such a relationship with others that one cannot exist without another.

91 Sunshine is the overall blanket-like form of sunbeams which appears with them ending on the surface of the earth etc.

92 The attributes which depend in their existence on other attributes would have the same relationship with those other attributes.

93 The main purpose behind proving the upper and lower degrees for the attributes is to establish these two degrees for the manifestations (*maẓāhir*) of the same attributes among the creations. Thus, the author now comes to this point.

creation, that person will be the epitome of ranks among all creations and the chief of all and better than all. That person will have the ability to briefly perform the perfect humility and submission, since ultimate embodiment requires ultimate capability in the acceptor.[94] The reason is that when manifestation and bestowal take place, they demand for the capacity as big as the bestowal itself.[95] It is therefore inevitable for the person who is the complete manifestation that he must be like a '*qālab*' (mould) for all divine characteristics.[96] To elaborate, the *qālab* and *maqlūb* have

---

94 The word 'epitome of attributes' also indicates that Allah's Apostle (PBUH) has been named '*khātam al-nabiyyīn*' (the last of the prophets) also in the sense that he is the epitome of this attribute, i.e. prophethood, and he is the ultimate embodiment of this attribute; above him there is no attribute that can be bestowed on anyone and other attributes depend on it. The only attribute possible above him is the source of the attributes or Godhead. That is why the possibility of embodiment and bestowal on creations has been stipulated as a condition. In a word, he is the greatest after God. Even if he, let us suppose, was not sent after all other prophets, he would still be '*khātam al-nabiyyīn*', as this title demonstrates his honor and his special status.

95 The optimum attribute which is dependent on by other attributes, i.e. the knowledge, the meaning and reality of its appearance is nothing but that it benefacts its ultimate embodiment (*maẓhar-e-kāmil*) who should be equipped with the knowledge of his predecessors and successors and his capacity of absorbing knowledge should be broad and strong enough to accommodate that benefaction. Furthermore, the extent of perfect humility and submission that can be performed by him, owing to his ultimate insight, is not possible from anyone other than him.

96 '*Qālab*' refers to a template which is filled by something to give it a shape, and the thing which is filled is called '*maqlūb*'. To illustrate, if a mould is filled with silver, the inner surface of the mould will be identical to the surface of '*maqlūb*' (the thing which is filled, such as the silver in this example, takes a bodily shape. The surface indicated here is the surface of that body). The above example has been presented to show this similarity.

identical shapes. The only difference is that the shape of the *qālab* (which is formed by its inner surface) is hollow and that of the *maqlūb* is solid.[97] Likewise, the one who has ultimate capability is required to be in the same shape, but empty from within, having all kinds of needs and thereby displaying all kinds of humility and submission. Such a person is the one whom we call the perfect worshipper, chief of both worlds, and the last of the prophets, and the reason for calling him so is evident from this discussion.

The question that remains now is who is this person? We claim that he is the Prophet Muḥammad, may Allah's peace and blessings be upon him. We have briefly shed light on this topic, keeping in view the availability of space, in the answer to the objection about facing the Holy Kaaba (which is entitled *qiblā numā*). It could be published before or after this write-up.

To put it briefly, the perfect worship is not possible from other than the last of the prophets (PBUH), as the perfect worship does not mean to keep oneself busy day and night, rather it is such accumulation of humility and submission which furnishes for every divine attribute an appropriate kind of humility and submission.[98]

---

97 But this difference does not pose any objection since the objective here is just to describe the similarity in the shape formed by matching the two. It should be noted that the word '*qālib*' in Urdu language is used for the wooden block which is hollowed out and used as a frame to cut out caps. If the author has referred to this '*qālib*', the '*maqlūb*' would be the cape, but then the above statement "the shape of the *qālib* is hollow and that of the *maqlūb* is solid" will lack clarity. Thus, the correct word is '*qālab*' which is in Urdu used for the mould.

98 This will, additionally, clarify why millions of worshippers and devotees of this Ummah whose prayers have been doubled and multiplied in quantity from that of the Prophet Muhammad

(PBUH) and yet their worship could not go higher than that of the Prophet (PBUH). The reason is that the kind of humility and submission offered by him in regard to all attributes of Allah the Exalted, which was the result of complete recognition of Allah, could not be offered by anyone else. That is the reason why all prostrates of the nation combined cannot coequal with one prostrate of him.

The conclusion is that among those divine attributes whose manifestation on human beings is possible, the attribute of knowledge is the epitome of the attributes (*khātam al-ṣifāt*), and whoever is the complete embodiment of this attribute, he will be the epitome of the ranks (*khātam al-marātib*). Since the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) was the complete embodiment of this attribute, he is the epitome of the ranks. Another thing is that the perfect worship is the one which includes humility and submission in regard to all divine attributes. Although all divine attributes cannot be regarded elaborately due to their infinite nature, the brief regard is possible (brief here refers to such type as what happens in universal concepts (*kulliyyāt*) which encompasses all of its particulars (*juz'iyyāt*), not the kind of brief regard that is in the case of "آمنت بالله كما هو بأسمائه وصفاته الخ" (I believe in Allah however he is with his names and attributes), as this is merely partial knowledge and such brief knowledge is possessed by every believer). And since such regard depends on the complete knowledge, such worship can only be offered by the person who has complete knowledge. It goes without saying that you will display humility before a dominant ruler, a profound scholar, or an expert physician only if you are informed of their dominance, profoundness, and expertise. Thus, knowledge is the prerequisite for all the etiquettes of humility and submission. Hence, the humility and submission with regard to all attributes can only be offered by someone who has complete knowledge of those attributes. And such a human being is none other than the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH). Once this perfect person has offered perfect worship, the purpose of the creation of this world is fulfilled. The actual purpose of creating the heavens and earth was only the worship of God, or in other words, the purpose was the offer of perfect worship which was conditional on the appearance of the holy personality of the epitome of the ranks (based on this we can say that although the words of the sacred tradition (*ḥadīth qudsī*), لولاك لما خلقت الأفلاك (were it not for you, I would not have created the

Back to the main topic; proof of the Judgement Day: However, once the ultimate worship has been offered, then just as the completion of cooking and preparation of all cuisines is followed by closure of the kitchen and winding up of the business, the same should be applied here that the time has come to bring this world to an end. If something is awaited, it is the spread of the religion throughout the world so as not a single human being remains without adhering to the religion of the last Prophet (PBUH).

The reason is that everything exists for a purpose, and unless it is used for that purpose, its existence is unavailing. If bread is baked and is not eaten or water is sought and is not drunk, then the bread and water are wasted. When we pondered the religion of the last Prophet (PBUH), we found it for the entire world, owing to the fact that the last Prophet has the status of the supreme king among humans, and just as his (the king's) rule is effective throughout the kingdom, so should be the rule of the last Prophet (PBUH), i.e. his religion, prevailing throughout the world. Otherwise, bringing this religion will go in vain.

Being the perfect worshipper demands for worldwide sovereignty and global dominance: As the last Prophet (PBUH) is the perfect worshipper for the Supreme Being, he is also the predominant ruler for the

universe), have dispute in their status in terms of the principles of *ḥadīth* and narrations, its meaning is indisputably an established truth). Now that the main purpose has been accomplished, and there remains no one who can possibly comply with that perfect worship, rather there will not even survive those who just imitate the acts of that worship, so this whole cosmos will not be needed anymore. Thus, bringing this to an end is the logical consequence, and that is called the Dooms Day.

entire human race. His rulership is unquestionable since he is the best among all, and therefore he deserves to be the ruler over all. Moreover, it requires that his rule should be issued after all other rules because the decree of the highest authority comes after all other decrees. However, once the rule of the supreme authority comes, everyone has to obey it whether willingly or unwillingly.

In brief, the perfectness of worship is found in worship from the last Prophet, and the absoluteness of his sovereignty lies in global dominance. And the existence of both of these is compulsory; perfectness of worship as a result of the perfectness of Deity, i.e. comprehensiveness of divine attributes, and the absoluteness of dominance as a consequence of the last Prophet's rule. Evidently, the perfectness of worship in the first form is qualitative,[99] while in the second form it is quantitative.[100] And there is no other form of the perfectness of worship besides these two. Thus after appearance of both forms of perfectness, this world, which was created for the worship, is bound to be ceased, and that is what we call the Dooms Day, and it is to be followed by the exercise of accountability and reckoning and the pronouncement of the reward and punishment, which we refer to as the Day of Judgement, the Day of Gathering, and the Day of Sorting out.

---

99 In the first form, i.e. the perfectness of worship, the humility and submission, which are from qualities, are offered with respect to limitless attributes of God. Therefore, the author called this the qualitative perfectness of worship.

100 The second form, i.e. the perfectness of the sovereignty, which is the result of global dominance, is also based on the perfectness of worship; since the purpose of this global dominance is to make humankind, who are quantitative considering their countability, bow down before the True God. This is why it has been termed as the quantitative perfectness of worship.

The rationale behind calling it the Day of Judgement is self-evident. As for the reason of naming it the Day of Gathering, it goes without saying that it will be an enormous assembly that day.[101] And it is termed the Day of Sorting out because pious and sinners are intermixed in this world, but that day they all will be separated so as everyone will be sent to his appropriate place and will get what he deserves; either reward or punishment. Those who deserve paradise will be sent there and those who belong to hell will be taken there.

Further,[102] if growth and development are the functions of 'power of growth', formation, i.e. to give

---

101 After recognizing the God and his absolute power, this is no longer incomprehensible. Raising such doubts as that the creations from the inception of this universe till its last day will be so huge in number that they will be beyond any counting, and it is unimaginable that they could fit in this space even if they stand together shoulder to shoulder, such doubts are resulted by the misconception that the nature and size of the ground that day will be same as they are today. But when the Absolutely-Powerful Being will completely vanish this universe and will bring it back, what makes it obligatory for him to make it the same size as it is today? It is totally reasonable to believe that its vastness may be manifolded million times of its current magnitude. Perhaps, the statement of Qur'an that neither the earth nor skies of that day will be same as they are today is to clear this very doubt. The Qur'an states:

يَوْمَ تُبَدَّلُ الْأَرْضُ غَيْرَ الْأَرْضِ وَالسَّمَاوَاتُ ۖ وَبَرَزُوا لِلَّهِ الْوَاحِدِ الْقَهَّارِ

Translation: On the Day the earth will be replaced by another earth, and the heavens [as well], and all creatures will come out before Allah, the One, the Prevailing. [Ibrahim, 14:48]

102 **The proof of the Judgement Day from the perspective of physics:** For full comprehension of this argument, we deem it necessary to explain the needful from natural qualities of souls, their factors, and related terminologies so that the readers could comprehensively grasp the matter. It is therefore stated that the word 'soul' (*nafs*) accounts for three interrelated divisions; the

vegetative soul (*nafs-e-nabātī*), the sensitive soul (*nafs-e-ḥaiwānī*), and the intellectual or rational soul (*nafs-e-nāṭiqah*). These three are the subject of discussion in physics, and it seems appropriate to provide some elaboration on these three, according to the demand of the context.

Description of souls' powers: All three types of soul have three common powers which are found in each of them; power of nourishment (*quwwat-e-ghādhiyah*), power of growth (*quwwat-e-munmiyah*), and power of reproduction (*quwwat-e-tawlīd-e-mithl*).

The nourishment power helps the body to obtain and consume nourishment from food. It performs its function in cooperation with four faculties, namely the faculty of alluring (*jādhibah*), faculty of holding (*māsikah*), faculty of digesting (*hāḍimah*), and faculty of pushing (*dāfi'ah*). The function of the alluring faculty is to attract and bring the food to the required place. The work of the holding faculty is to keep the food for so long that the digestive faculty could complete its process. The digesting faculty cooks the food, and the pushing faculty drives the waste material out of the body.

The role of the power of growth (*munmiyah*, or sometimes called *nāmiyah*) is to grow and develop the body. It functions in collaboration with the aforementioned nourishment power as well as amending power (*quwwat-e-mughayyirah*) which makes changes in the quality and quantity of body particles thereby causing the power of growth to develop the body to an appropriate degree.

The third power, the reproduction (*quwwat-e-tawlīd*, or sometimes referred to as *quwwat-e-muwallidah* or *quwwat-e-muṣawwirah* (the formative faculty), but some philosophers have made a distinction between *muwallidah* and *muṣawwirah*), operates to shape bodies based on the species they belong to (as well as to produce sperms in animal beings). It exercises its role by working together with the nourishment and the formative faculties which give shapes to organs according to their species. The vegetative soul is said to possess only these powers.

As for the sensitive soul, it possesses two more capacities in addition to the aforementioned ones; the capacity of sense perception (*quwwat-e-idrāk-e-ālī*) and the capacity of willful movement (*quwwat-e-teḥrīk-e-irādī*). The function of the first capacity is apparent from its name; that it brings things into perception through the medium of senses. The senses are then divided into two categories.

External and Internal senses: First category is external senses. Its sensory instruments are on the external body, which are ear, eye, nose, tongue, skin and some muscles, and that is why these are called the five external senses. The ear perceives sounds, the eye sees visible objects, the nose smells, the tongue tastes, and the skin senses the touch of material objects as well as the abstracts such as presence of air and the heat and cold etc.

Second category is internal senses. They are also five; common sense, retentive imagination, compositive imagination, estimative faculty, and memory.

It is worth considering that each external sense functions only in the realm of its sensory capacity. Ear can only hear; it cannot see, smell, or taste. Eye can only see; it cannot hear, smell, or taste. The rest of the senses also work in the same way.

It is interesting to note that the perception of all these senses depends on presence and verbal expression. You can hear a sound only so long as it is being produced. Once it has stopped, the ear stops the process of perception as well. As long as an object is present in front of eye, the eye apprehends its image, but it stops this cognitive function as soon as the object disappears. The case of the rest can be understood by these examples. However, the Almighty God has ingrained in every sensitive soul an internal faculty which encompasses all the senses and has the ability to detect audible, visible, smellable, testable, and tangible. That is why this faculty is called ‘common sense’, as it is not specific to a particular cognitive function. It perceives absent just like external senses perceive present. It is a unique and precious gift of God which collects and preserves images of all the objects that you see, all the sounds that you hear, the distinct flavors that your tongue tastes, the fragrances and odors that your nose smells, and the heat and cold detected by your faculty of sensation. This is a strange and infinite treasure of information which has no limit, that is to say, it cannot get so full that no space is left for new information and it bursts if more information is shoved down. So blessed is Allah, the best of creators. So that's that about the faculty of common sense.

The second faculty which is essential for the common sense to be effective is retentive imagination. The retentive imagination is the caretaker of common sense’s treasure and the agent of rational soul. It serves to bring out the necessary information, when required, from that treasure and present it to the rational soul. When an image appears before eyes after a long period, the

retentive imagination would immediately bring out that image from the treasure, and the intellect would recognize that image and would indentify, for example, that person as Zaid. You will never, while looking at sweets, think of the spicy flavor because this treasurer would present the impression of their taste, which was preserved by the common sense, to the intellect, and the intellect would perceive their flavor even before they reach the tongue. Similarly, if someone is travelling and suddenly hears a lion's voice which he had heard before and which was saved in that treasure, in that event suppose if this faculty of retentive imagination was not there, the intellect would not have realized and would not have taken measures for his safety. In short, had this faculty not been there, the treasure of the common sense would have been of no use and humans would be useless for God and for the world. Rather, even animals could not survive.

The third internal sense is compositive imagination which acts over the information preserved by the common sense. For example, it composes some sensibles with others, such as combining a human and wings and imagining a human who has wings, or it separates one part of something from another, like imagining one eyed animal which actually has two eyes. Most of today's miraculous inventions are the result of this faculty.

The fourth sense is estimative faculty. It discerns specific meanings from detected images, such as Zaid's love for his son or wolf's animosity towards goat. (We stipulated specific meaning since perceiving general concepts is the function of intellect, so intellect is analogous to a master and all these faculties are comparable to its servants). It helps the intellect to apprehend general concepts. This description should also clear up the difference between retentive imagination and estimative faculty as the role of the retentive imagination is not to discern specific meanings rather to take care of collected information and present it to the intellect. This faculty is also very crucial.

The fifth sense is memory. It is a treasure of meanings just like the common sense is the treasure of words. This faculty looks after this treasure and presents it to the intellect or the heart just as the retentive imagination presents sensory information. According to philosophers, all of these faculties are centered in brain, and they are connected to their centers in a way known to none other than the Omniscient and All-Informed Creator. The source of these faculties is unseen. Just like faculties of hearing and sighting are unseen but their visible instruments, i.e. organs, are present on

the physical body, similarly the physicists have identified different parts of brain as the localized centers of these faculties. To the author, however, all of these faculties are centered in heart. Anyway, God has made a small portion of the common sense such a strange museum that stores millions and billions of images, sounds, distinct tastes, and varying smells, and so comprehensive that all the museums of the world combined cannot stand in front of one of these. Overall, this discussion was about the power of sense perception.

The second capacity of the sensitive soul, as we mentioned earlier, is the capacity of willful movement. This capacity is then classified into two subdivisions; first is the one which inclines to acquiring benefits, and it is called 'vigor of carnal passions' (*quwwat-e-shahawī*), while second concerns prevention of harm, and it is named 'vigor of rage' (*quwwat-e-ghaḍabī*). These are the powers possessed by the sensitive soul, and due to purity or lack of purity in these powers, animals have differences among each other. Among other species, human kind is the best representation of these capacities thanks to absolute purity of these powers in human beings. Human soul, owing to a unique power, that is going to be discussed soon after, has the ability to benefit the most from these capacities. As per physicists, human soul is distinct from other animal souls on account of an additional capacity.

Technical meaning of "*ḥaiwān nāṭiq*": The technical name of that capacity is '*quwwat-e-nuṭq*'. The word '*nuṭq*' literally translates to 'speech'. When human being is termed '*ḥaiwān nāṭiq*', the meaning that is generally understood is 'the speaking animal'. Though it holds true that animals lack the ability to speak in a clear tone and with proper pronunciation of words, the presence of this capacity in them cannot be denied. Every animal speaks in its peculiar voice, and it is therefore incorrect to specify speech with human being. Nonetheless, the ability that is exclusive to human being is technically termed '*quwwat-e-nuṭq*', the intended meaning of which is "the capacity to perceive without any instrument" and "apprehension of underlying realities from the images and distinguishing between them". It is with respect to this meaning that human being is called 'the rational animal' and his soul is named 'the rational soul'. Using this cognitive power, humans acquire knowledge of the realities of existents and sensible information which are beyond the power of other sensory instruments. Rather, those instruments are even unable to apprehend themselves; eye cannot see itself, the sight

appropriate shape and form to growing bodies, is the task of 'formative power'.

The formative power serves the power of growth which serves life in animal beings: But since growth results in a particular form, the formative power seems to be a servant of the power of growth, just as the power of growth is a servant of life in animal beings.

On one hand, we observed the world (i.e. the seen world as compared to unseen or *ghaib*) and found it full of forms, and we noticed that every form contains one property (*waṣf*) and one essence (*ma'anā*). It indicates that every property and every essence holds one form which is observable in the seen world, or you can call the tangible world. So, soil is actually the form of dryness, water is the form of wetness, fire is the form of heat, and human being is the form of a bunch of essences (i.e. a bunch of those realities mentioned in the introductory discussion), since he comprises diverse forms. That is to say, human soul is the combination of various capacities such as the capacity of

---

cannot comprehend its nature, and other faculties also have the same situation. The intellect, however, is aware of all these realities.

One question may be raised at this point, that the task of the internal and external senses is to present their acquired knowledge and information to the intellect, but then which powers the intellect employs to derive general concepts and to make useful deductions? What is the nature of the intellect? Is it some immaterial substance or a subtle physique? If the answer to these questions could be summarized in a few lines, we would have touched upon this matter, but the discussion would go very lengthy. As of now, our objective was just to explain the nature of sensory and cognitive capacities, which was essential to understand the upcoming argument. These questions will be dealt with at some other occasion.

seeing and hearing etc.[103] And all these are properties and essences (which are unseen), and the form bestowed in return is a product of the composition of various organs, i.e. that is a compound form.

On the other hand, with further observation we realized that those properties and essences which come about after the formed properties and essences[104] still have not materialized and are yet to embrace a form. Therefore, the growth power of the universe necessitates that just as pigeon and chicken and other birds' mating and desire, which are from the properties and essences (and are the cause of generating the property and essence), produce eggs, and from that egg hatches out a baby bird and the process goes on a long way, and all this is caused by manipulation of the growth and formative powers, similarly

---

103 The learned author is suggesting that all capacities are in fact attributed to the soul. It means that the soul which is a subtle substance is characterized (*mauṣūf*), and the faculties of hearing and sighting et cetera are its characteristic. In tangible world, these characteristics of the soul work with physical instruments of the five senses, i.e. the eye, nose, and ear etc.

104 Those properties of the soul emerge from those compound forms to a much less degree than from the soul itself. Ear can only work within a limited area of few yards not beyond that, eye cannot see beyond a certain distance, and so on. That said, the same capacities of the soul are much stronger, and they are not confined to such physical restrictions. As a poet says:

در راه عشق مرحله قرب وبعد نیست　　　می بینمت عیان ودعامی فرستمت

(Translation: In love's path, is no stage of nearness or of farness: I clearly see you; and prayer, I send you.)

Similarly, there are other properties and essences as well which take place after these properties, i.e. the ability to do good or bad deeds and the forms of paradise or hell that are going to take place as a consequence once such deeds have been performed.

those unformed essences should appear and come into sight. It is because this world is indeed the result of manipulation of the power of growth, since the formative power is actually a servant of the power of growth.[105] Thus, the manifestation of the power of growth in animals and plants is like the appearance of sunlight in mirrors, particles, and windows. Just like light in these objects is the reflection of the actual source of light, i.e. the sun, so is the illustration of the power of growth anywhere in the universe the manifestation of the actual source, which can be named the 'universal power of growth'.[106] However, when we found some of the properties and essences still unformed, as all voluntary actions and their property of being good or bad are yet to take a form,[107] we realized that this world is still in the stage similar to an egg.

To elaborate, the egg itself is a consequential form of desire and mating of two birds, and the desire itself belongs to properties and essences, but the essence hidden therein have not been materialized thus far. It is only after hatching out of the chick that we come to know how much energy was hidden therein that has only emerged now. Prior to this stage, we only knew that this egg is the epitome of

---

105 What it means is that we witness the continuous and increasing operation of the formative power in animals and plants, and this power is the servant of the power of growth, so it proves that all this is actually the function of the power of growth.

106 That is, the power of growth of the celestial world influenced and manipulated all the existents of this terrestrial world. The source here refers to the celestial world.

107 In other words, we see that a person has been doing good deeds for years and the after-effect of his good deeds is yet to take place, and a person has been doing bad deeds for years and still the consequences have not befallen.

all the powers of both male and female, and thus at the time of expansion it must be bestowed a form that is consistent with the powers of both sides as the end result of integration and composition.

The same story can be seen throughout the physical world. It is also a epitome of the power of knowledge and the power of practice of the celestial world. This is the reason why not every essence has obtained a form.[108] In short, you may call this world the epitome of divine knowledge, divine power, and other divine attributes because if this world was an elaboration, all the essences would have had a form.

The conclusion of the above discussion: It is inevitable that just as the growth and formative powers influence the substance of egg which results in changing the form and breaking the egg apart, so the same will happen to this world and with the impact of the growth and formative powers this form of the world will be destroyed and the substance of this world will obtain another form.

Proof of Dooms Day from political viewpoint: The custom of the rulers of this world is that when inhabitants of a particular city or town turn rebels and do not agree to submit, the rulers then inflict on them severe punishment. They are either sentenced to death or given life imprisonment, their city is often burned and turned into ashes, and their dwellings are

108 As egg contains the powers of male and female, similarly the physical world accommodates two different powers from the celestial world; the power of knowledge and the power of practice. Once the manifestation of form is complete, it will break like the egg and those details will be exposed. That will be the occasion of disclosure of actions' properties.

demolished and reduced to ruins. The reason is that treason is the worst offence, and as such it deserves the most severe kind of punishment.

A contemplation in this world discloses that human beings are the subjects (*ra'iyyat*) of God, and the earth and heavens are their inhabitations since they have been created for them, as we have discussed earlier. And their situation is such that everyone will acknowledge the rise in disobedience and defiance with every passing day throughout the world. Even if humans, for a short period, come to the right path, it is similar to a dying lamp's lightening before it goes out. Thus, it is indeed convincing that one day this rebellion will spread out and will become worldwide.

The reason for wide-spread denial and defiance: And why will it not be the case when the basis of rebellion is desire which is natural, while the basis of obedience is opposition of desire which is accidental (*'arḍī*).[109] This is the reason why books and messengers were sent and the promises of reward and torment were made for the purpose of obedience. None of these was done for disobedience and defiance. And since[110] all this will happen after the period

109 The Quranic verse "إِنَّ النَّفْسَ لَأَمَّارَةٌ بِالسُّوءِ" (Indeed, the soul is a persistent enjoiner of evil) outlines this natural desire, and the next, "إِلَّا مَا رَحِمَ رَبِّي" (except those upon which my Lord has mercy), expresses the accidental situation which encompasses sending out prophets and messengers and transmission of the message of guidance. The author contends…

110 Here, the author points to the answer of an unexpressed doubt that whenever the common behavior of humans became corrupt, the prophets and messengers were sent to guide them, and then came torment. When the same situation will occur in the later time and the rebellion against God will prevail, why no messenger will be

of the final Prophet (PBUH),[111] when the purpose of worship will have been completed, thus keeping a watch and making use of them will no more be required.[112] Who takes work from workers once they have completed their task?

The Conclusion: It is inevitable that one day disbelief will become prevailing and the whole world will turn rebel against God. At that time, according to the demand of the attribute of 'The Superb Vanquisher' (*al-Qahhār*),[113] He will certainly wipe off the world and apprehend all humans to give them what they deserved, i.e. the reward or punishment.

sent for that period, as has always been happening, so that Allah's affirmation is established?

111 Whose teachings and commands will be preserved till the beginning of that period, and therefore Allah's affirmation will be established without arrival of a new prophet.

112 It is because the final prophet has offered perfect worship with respect to every divine attribute, which has been discussed earlier, and his followers have performed his obedience up to their capacity, so the purpose of creating this universe is now complete.

113 There is an indication that by the end of the period of the final Prophet (PBUH), the period of His attribute of mercy will also come to an end and the period of the attribute of 'The Superb Vanquisher' will begin.

Index

ABOUT THE BOOK

The book in hand, Intiṣār al-Islām, is a representation of the long-running conflict between truth and falsehood. It was written in response to philosophical objections raised by Pundit Dayanand Saraswati against Islamic creeds. Intiṣār al-Islām has been enjoying an esteemed acknowledgement as the authorship of Ḥujjat al-Islām Ḥaḍrat Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānautavī by academic societies and scholarly circles for almost a century now.

Ḥujjat al-Islām Academy, which was established with an objective of reviving the intellectual legacy and scholarly heritage of Ulama-e-Deoband, has taken up to simplify and translate the writings of Ḥaḍrat Nānautavī in global languages. This translation of Intiṣār al-Islām into English is a result of the same noble pursuit. Hopefully, this humble attempt will be a valuable addition to the realm of knowledge in the form of coherent and well thought out responses to common objections raised against Islamic creeds and its philosophy on purely rational ground, and it will form a sound methodological basis for development of new 'Ilm al-Kalām.

Ḥujjat al-Islām Academy
Al-jamia al-Islamia Darululoom Waqf, Deoband

Eidgah Road, P.O. Deoband-247554, Distt: Saharanpur U.P. India
Tel : + 91-1336-222352, Mob: + 91-9897076726
Website: www.dud.edu.in
Email: hujjatulislamacademy@dud.edu.in, hujjatulislamacademy2013@gmail.com